



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_36995
Title of the Manuscript:	Children's Bill of Rights in Botswana: The Location and Dilemma for Social Workers
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	The article describes the rights of children established in the <i>Convention of the Right of the Child</i> and the <i>Children's Act of 2009</i> . The article offers interesting insights into the interpretation of these rights and how they could be implemented in Botswana. The authors argue that it may be difficult for social workers to implement the right to leisure, play and recreation in this context. The article further argues that social workers (SWs) should use the human rights framework for intervention, and describes the proposals of the National Association of Social Workers. Despite the thorough description of these proposals, the paper lacks a discussion about the interpretations of these laws in the context of Botswana. In relation to the interview with SWs, the sample was not representative and had few participants. Moreover, the paper does not describe the sample selection process. In the results section, the manuscript described the social workers' knowledge of children's rights and how they were implemented. Despite the authors clear conveyance of the SWs' frustrations with implementation; the results cannot be conclusive nor robust due to sample size. Fourteen social workers cannot be representative of the entire community of Botswanan SWs. Therefore, it is recommended to further examine and discuss children's rights in the context of Botswana law. Moreover, an increase in sample size of SWs is recommended. Likewise, an explicit description of the sample selection process is recommended.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martha Frías Armenta
Department, University & Country	Law Department, University of Sonora, Mexico