

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_94987
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of a social programme and poverty reduction in two districts of Peru
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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Overall, the paper shows that the finding gives good impact towards the community specially to support the SDG on poverty.</p> <p>2. If the author plan to remain the title, please do the comparison in each variable that the author discussed. Otherwise, it is suggested to change to Social Programme for Poverty Alleviation in Peru.</p> <p>3. No objectives stated in abstract and lack of discussion. I think, the author shouldn't have to give the % in the abstract.</p> <p>4. No subsection on literature review. I think it's also important to support your study based on previous research that have similar issues. From my reading, there's many research on poverty in South America country that you can refer to.</p> <p>5. Overall, the manuscript understandable and justified.</p> <p>6. No issue with references but please check the format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Suggest to author to proofread the manuscript.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Your study is on comparative study, but you didn't compare the findings. You just stated the relationship between SPT with the DV (reduction of poverty) and the IV (educational level, housing and basic services, health services, basic needs, and economic income) but no discussion to compare which district is acceptable and which not. From the discussion, then you can justify for Huancaspata, what is lacking and what can be done as well as for Chilia.</p> <p>And please add some discussion on LR.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zarina Mohd Zain
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia