



Paper: “The Effectiveness of Social Welfare Programs in Achieving Social Security for Homelessness in Friendly Schools”

Corresponding Author: Esam Talat Abdel

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p238

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Reem Zou'bi
AABU, Jordan

Reviewer 2: Ahmad Zeenalabedenn Ibrahim
Assiut University, Egypt

Reviewer 3: Sufi Amin
International Islamic University, Islambad Pakistan

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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!

Reviewer Name: Sufi Amin	
University/Country: Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/7/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/7/2020
Manuscript Title: The effectiveness Of Social Welfare Programs In Achieving Social Security For Homelessness In Friendly Schools	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0729/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	4
<i>Topic is clear.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Abstract needs to be rewritten in a very precise and succinct manner. Please include major conclusion(s), finding(s) & recommendation(s). An abstract is a self-	

contained, short, and powerful statement that describes a larger work. Abstract carries a number of structural and grammatical errors. The abstract is most widely read section of the thesis therefore it should be free of errors and should be written in clear and correct language	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are plenty of grammatical mistakes in the whole thesis. English grammar of the whole thesis is required to be reviewed and sentence/syntax mistakes are to be removed. Proof reading is required for whole research paper	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Methodology section is weak. It needs elaboration.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Not clear needs clarification.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Conclusions are inadequate and not properly drawn. Conclusions should be based on findings and recommendations should be made on the basis of conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Follow APA format.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: 6-7-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 7-7-2020
Manuscript Title: <b style="color: red;">The Effectiveness of Social Welfare Programs in Achieving Social Security for Homelessness in Friendly Schools.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b style="color: red;">29.07.2020.	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b style="color: red;">No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b style="color: red;">Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b style="color: red;">Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	5
<i style="color: red;">The title is clear and tackles an important issue in Egypt.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i style="color: red;">The author needs to specify more the results, the method he used throughout the paper, and future implications.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The paper is full of grammatical mistakes and needs proofreading.</i> 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The method needs to be explained more clearly.</i> <i>More details should be provided concerning the sampling (which I believe was not random) and the population size.</i> 	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The body is clear.</i> <i>The study problem and questions should be stated clearly.</i> <i>The following headings must be arranged as (Discussion- Conclusion- Recommendations).</i> <i>It is better to merge table 1 and table 2 into one table, If so the tables' numbering will be changed too.</i> 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The discussion was supported by limited references.</i> <i>The conclusion should restate the research topic, restate the thesis, summarize the main points, and state the paper's significance.</i> 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate but <u>very old</u></i> 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The author needs to add more recent references (2015- now)
- The paper scored zero in Turnitin test of similarity.
- The author needs to rewrite the reference list according to APA style.
- The study sample's ages ranged between 7 & 17 which were described differently by the author in the abstract.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: 6-7-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 7-7-2020
Manuscript Title: The effectiveness Of Social Welfare Programs In Achieving Social Security For Homelessness In Friendly Schools	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0729/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	5
<i>1-</i> The title is persuasive and adequate in length. <i>2-</i> The title variables are coherent and they are conveyed at the literature. <i>3-</i> The content of the research is well organized according to the title variables.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>1-</i> The abstract covers the study objects comprehensively. <i>2-</i> The methodology of the study was fully handled at the abstract.	

3- The findings of the study were discussed in general at the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- few grammatical mistakes are exit at the abstract. 2- The grammatical mistakes at the paper do not affect the research meaning and objects. 3- few grammatical mistakes are exit at the conclusion of the study. These mistakes are not significant and do not affect the research validity. 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The methodology of the study was clearly defined at the abstract and the research context 2- More statistical equations and techniques were used to support and enhance the theoretical field o study. 3- The researchers used the methods that suit the nature of the study and its variables. 	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The paper body is adequate and enough to cover the research objects. 2- The introduction and conclusion parts are clear and interrelated. 3- There aren't significant errors that affect the coherence of the paper body. 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The conclusions are comprehensive and persuasive. They contain detailed information that serves the study objects. 2- The conclusions are generated from both the theoretical and field frameworks. 3- The study summary is comprehensive and accurate and covers the research content in a fully way. 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- <i>The study references are up-to-date and adequate.</i> 2- <i>The references are related to the study variables.</i> 3- <i>The references are well-organized and appropriate or the stud objects.</i> 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: