



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_49236
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions of ex-convicts on rehabilitation programmes in preparing for reintegration in Botswana
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the author has provided background information on the topic under study, there is much to be done in order to make it full research study. There is confusion in this study because it doesn't show nature of the study e.g. field/primary data or literature review although it mentions 26 study participants at the abstract level. The abstract has provided information missing in the main document e.g. the author talks of conducting qualitative but there is no methodology in the main body of the document. The author needs to acknowledge sources to avoid allegations e.g. <i>A study conducted revealed that there are more of the negative views about rehabilitation programmes than the positives.</i> The author should show how the theories mentioned explains the study. A research project should provide all the sections required e.g. introduction, methodology and results but the author hasn't demonstrated this. The topic is on perception on rehabilitation but the author has not presented findings on same. The author should provide conclusion and recommendation based on the results presented and should clearly link to the topic. 	<p>Corrections have been made</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Corrected in the ms</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	There is need to reorganize the study and clearly show major sections of the study in order to show the aim of the study	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	