

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_92125
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Impact of School Inspections to Students' Academic Performance in Primary Schools: The Case of Mvomero District
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:

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

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The "1.0 Introduction" section looks like a literature review. I would suggest this section be titled "literature review" or "background", and follow the "Introduction" section, or otherwise edit it in-depth. The introduction should briefly place the study in a broad context and highlight why it is important. It should define the purpose of the work and its significance, including specific hypotheses being tested. The current state of the research field should be reviewed carefully, and key publications cited or create a new section. Please highlight controversial and diverging hypotheses when necessary. Finally, briefly mention the main aim of the work. Keep the introduction comprehensible to scientists working outside the topic of the paper. To help you, here is a list of items that can be included in this section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What is the importance of making this research/contribution that it brings to the literature in the field? -Why should readers be interested? -What problem / gap resolve / fill this research? -To fill this gap (resolve this problem) what solution / intervention / benefits does this research bring? (In other words, how the proposed study will remedy this deficiency / gap / problem and provide a unique contribution to the literature) -What is the research question which addresses the purpose of the research? <p>The "2.0 Research Methodology" section needs revision. Some information and / or points are missing or unclear, such as, for example, the type of methodology, information about the methods you used, reliability, the consent protocol, ethical issues, etc. New methods and protocols should be described in detail while well-established methods can be briefly described and appropriately cited. Give the name and version of any software used and make clear whether computer code used is available. Include any pre-registration codes.</p> <p>Kindly check for grammatical and syntax errors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The "3.0 Research Finding and Discussion" section and the "4.0 Conclusion and Recommendations" section seem to be well argued. Please extend these sections a little more. Please cite more of the journal papers published by Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies where possible.</p> <p>The existing references are useful references and interesting, it may also make the manuscript more interesting if the author/s could use the following reference: https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9030196</p> <p>Certain sections of the manuscript begin or end abruptly, which may reduce the reader's attention or interest. I would suggest you could consider including some introductory paragraphs regarding the content of each section, in order to give the reader an idea of what to expect. After the revision of your manuscript (in all sections), you may need to revise or re-edit the abstract or even the title.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>You may need to move some parts to other sections for there to be a logical flow.</p> <p>More recent references are required.</p> <p>Comparative analysis with the state-of-the-art studies is required.</p> <p>Kindly read your manuscript again with a clear mind and make the necessary corrections.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Constantinos Nicolaou
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece