

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_102979
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE IN NSUKKA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA: THE IMPACT OF INFORMAL COMMUNITY LEADERS
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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>No. The authors conducted a simplistic statistical analysis derived from survey results, which unfortunately didn't yield any significant contributions. The lack of explanation for their surveying process raises serious questions about the reliability and replicability of the research.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. I would recommend the author to prioritize the most critical points. The abstract should briefly outline the purpose, methodology, key findings, and conclusions of the study in a succinct, yet informative manner.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The manuscript does indeed follow the basic structure of scientific articles; however, the content needs to be significantly deepened.</p> <p>No. The article, intended for peer-review in a journal, cites around 15 references, with the vast majority dating prior to 2018. This suggests that the authors were unsuccessful in identifying the research gap and in developing appropriate scientific methods to conduct their analysis</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors must clearly outline their data collection process to ascertain the reliability and replicability of their research. It would also be beneficial to reference a substantial number of similar research articles to explain the scientific methodology employed. The research questions should extend beyond a superficial analysis based solely on raw data, as this can raise concerns about the study's contributions. A more profound analysis should be incorporated into the discussion section to articulate the significance of the research and its potential contributions to the scientific community.</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:	Yifeng Tian
Department, University & Country	USA