

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_85205
Title of the Manuscript:	A practice-based methodology on conducting a collaborative scoping review with PRISMA-ScR model for the separated refugee youth project.
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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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	I am happy to review and assess this interesting review article, entitled. "A practice-based methodology on conducting a collaborative scoping review with PRISMA-ScR model for the separated refugee youth project". The aim of this scoping review to review extant literature involving the extent, range, geography, and nature of research on the study of impact of family loss and separation among refugee youth. And offer recommendations for the ongoing research and possible implications for research and practice. However, this manuscript need minor revision, as I have mentioned bellow. This manuscript can be accepted after minor revision.	Noted
Minor REVISION comments	Some minor comments are: 1) The manuscript does not contain any section number. Hence, mark the section with number for better clarity. For instance, starting from introduction with section 1 and also provide subsection number if there is subsection. 2) No mention of how this study is organized, which may bring difficulty for the redear of the article. Therefore, in the last paragraph of first section (Introduction section) provide a brief description of how rest of the study is organized. 3) Need minor attention on grammar including uses of comma, and intext citation. 4) Limitation provided by author lacks comprehensiveness and preciseness. Thus, provide clear and broad limitations. 5) Reference list need care, as some references have not written in right format.	OK Ok
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	