

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_93508
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GARISSA TOWNSHIP SUB-COUNTY, KENYA
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This inquiry poses the concern about the implementation of safety standards at public schools. As such, it must be welcome.</p> <p>However, it presents failures that must be solved.</p> <p>The most important one is the definition of the variables of the problem. Apparently, according to section "Objectives of the Study", there are five: safety Sub-committee, physical infrastructure, financial resources, training of teachers, and safety standards and guidelines. The purpose of the authors is to study if any of the first four influences on the fifth.</p> <p>These variables were to be measured based on the results of the application of two instruments: a questionnaire and a set of interviews. However, there is quite not a word about how this was made (only a short reference about composition of interviews schedule). So, it makes no sense the use of any statistical instrument to study eventual relationships between variables.</p> <p>There is another issue about this question. Although construction and testing of the questionnaire and interview schedule could be a merit of the authors, information gathered with them will necessarily have a subjective component. However, relevant information about some of the variables can be collected by objectives means, such as official documents referring, for example, to the number and class of fire stations, general conditions of the buildings, and programs for teacher training in the use of safety protocols.</p> <p>On another hand, some of the conclusions don't appear to be drawn from results of the instruments.</p> <p>In order to solve these issues, I suggest attending, at least, the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Define explicitly variables used, giving information about questionnaire and interviews schedule: type and number of items, for one side, and how they are related to each variable, for the other.</li> <li>2) Explain why and how statistical instruments were chosen and used, arguing about their pertinence for the purposes of the study.</li> <li>3) Comment the reasons why other sources of information were discarded.</li> <li>4) Present conclusions that are clearly based upon the consideration of both sources of information.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>All along the manuscript there are long paragraphs, frequently with poor punctuation or syntax. Their length and redaction style make their reading difficult.</p> <p>Additionally, some of them contains a mix of conceptual references with data analysis or presentation of conclusions.</p> <p>I suggest pay attention at this problem using some of the following resources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Separate references from elaborations of the authors, presenting the firsts at a different section.</li> <li>2) Use tables to present results or analysis of data, that ease the lecture of text.</li> <li>3) Use an adequate punctuation and syntax.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Catholic University of Uruguay, Uruguay</b>