

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: October 22 nd , 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: October 24 th , 2017
Manuscript Title: DYNAMICS OF TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS AND THE ROLE OF THE SOCIAL WORKER (ALBANIAN CASE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b style="color: orange;">1119/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Suggest adding criminality to the key words	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> In general objects are adequately mentioned. Methods are unclear.	2
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The paper is poorly written; several statements are unclear due to grammatical mistakes.	2

Thorough editing is a must to allow publication.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> There is no clear methodology in this paper.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The body of the paper needs many corrections. The use of slavery, slaves, and forced labor should be clearly defined as concepts with specific academic and legal definitions. Several sentences are either incomplete or unclear. For example, “the victims return to their will or forced” Also: “probe deeper in a social environment in which the individuals lives.” The reference in the text to NGOs and some Reports is not documented with clear names and dates.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusions were not strongly founded on the paper’s findings. They were rather theoretical. They did not show the social work/workers’ actual input to control the activity or to enhance rehabilitation worldwide or specifically in Albania.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Some references are not adequately mentioned in text. Revision is strongly recommended.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Slavery and slaves are sensitive issues that are internationally sensitive, abhorred, prohibited, and strictly punishable. The text needs careful editing, as well as clear concept definitions of slavery, forced labour, and slave labour, etc. It is not advisable to use them interchangeably in this paper.

Why is it Albanian Government criminalize only some slavery forms? What forms are not yet criminalized? What documentary evidence is possibly available?

The section on social work/workers is disproportionately represented. The paper does not adequately explain the micro, mezzo, and macro dynamics of social work/workers as stressed in Abstract. This needs thorough revision. What is the possibility that social workers would be able to collaborate with human rights’ activists, law-enforcement officers, and law-abiding politicians and citizens to “identify the state's ambiguous role in relation to the THB when the paper alleged serious accusations to the Government’s poor performance

towards THB, but even corruption and exploitation of the whole issue.

This paper is a significant contribution to the THB criminality and humanitarian implication. It should be edited thoroughly well. You also need to check the footnotes and citations in text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The author made essential effort to highlight core facts about THB. Once publication requirements are fully realized, this paper will add a great deal to the public awareness on the issue.

