



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_47226
Title of the Manuscript:	The Influence of Vocational Rehabilitation for Societal Re-integration of Inmates in Nigerian Prisons in Rivers State
Type of the Article	Original paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The structure and components of this paper are proper and clear, especially the purpose, questions, hypotheses, and the results are pretty clear. The study is meaningful. Generality speaking this paper is worthy of being published. However, it will be much better if the author rectifies it as following suggestion: 1. The paper should better illustrate the method as quantitative method. 2. Analysis should be more profound or deep. The scores of different items in Table 3 are different between officers and inmates, for instance, the RMKs of items 43-46, 48 are much different between the two kind of respondents. Why? The reasons is important to the last part of suggestion. However, the paper just described the Grand Mean/SD of them and tested HO2 with table 5, which to some extent covered up the detail facts.	1. The method cannot just be quantitative as specified by reviewers. This is because quantitative research method comprises others such as descriptive, evaluative, experimental, quasi-experimental, expo-facto among others. Base on this reason, there is need to clearly identify the specific method adopted. 2. The differences in the remarks (RMK) of the two groups are very clear. This is because what the inmates may see and presume as a challenge may not be a challenge as perceived by the officers and vice versa. This reason(s) is responsible for the differences in their response. For instance, on item 43, officers disagree. This implies that they are qualified in training the inmates where as the inmates agreed that the officers are not qualified for training.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	