

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_93789
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of glass of milk program and satisfaction of beneficiaries in a province 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> )

### 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	The researcher has major revisions to be made since the document lack literature, and there is lack of clarity in conclusion of the abstract. The title of the paper is good but the scope differs from the title and the main document. At one point you stated "a province of Peru" at another point you stated "a province of Trujillo ", so which of the two scopes are you using, be specific and consistent. The abstract has to be formatted. A good abstract must contain the following: purpose of the study, summary of the method, and findings. Sometimes you can add one or two recommendations. It should not be more than 250 words. The researcher has to reword the abstract to bring clarity to it. The study must add a section for literature review. The study lacks proper in-text-citations, and needs a thorough edit to check grammar and punctuations.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Edit the work Make sure to follow the appropriate in-text citations and references styles (APA, etc.). The study lacks appropriate in-text citations.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good article but needs a little improvement.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Augustine Adu Frimpong
Department, University & Country	Southern University, A & M College, USA