

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_76730
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC FACTORS HINDERING EVANGELISM IN THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN TANZANIA - IRINGA DIOCESE
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract. It is recommended that authors review the rules regarding the maximum number of characters to be used. In the same way, I believe that it could help to briefly include the most important results achieved in the research.2. Introduction and Literature review. In my opinion, the introduction is too short and does not correctly delimit the objective of the research work. It would be convenient to make clear at this point the specific objectives of the work and the way to reach them. I think this part is important to leave well defined the contextual state of the work. In the same way, the number of references used in the article seems to me to be scarce (only 9 references).3. Methods. In my opinion, the main problem of manuscript. I believe that this "leap" made by the authors should be sufficiently explained from the methodological point of view.4. Finally, I believe that the Discussion section must necessarily incorporate in the article.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dalia Perkumienė
Department, University & Country	Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania