

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_101153
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EDUCATIONAL SUPERVISION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE: SUYE SECONDARY SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY
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 '**Jack 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Fair</p> <p>Fair, it is better that the sentence "SUYE SECONDARY SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY" be replaced with "A CASE STUDY IN SUYE SECONDARY SCHOOL", Consider revising it</p> <p>No, The abstract subsection generally contains the research background, research objective, research method, and research findings (explicitly stated). Please revise</p> <p>Fair</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Fair. Remove references that are over 15 years old, because they have expired to serve as references and replace them with new references measuring five years and under. Note: The majority of references in your article should be references to the latest scientific journal articles that are under 5 years old. Consider revising it or adding to it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No comments</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>* (In Introduction), the authors must explain what is different from this proposed work of earlier works (What is the uniqueness and strength/novelty of your research). Or it can be expressed at the end of the discussion in the review of related studies sub-section, by comparing it with previous related articles</p> <p>* In the methodology sub-section, the phrase " qualitative design" should be replaced with " qualitative method".</p> <p>* In the methodology subsection, It is better to include a list of open interview questions in the paper in the form of a weblink.</p> <p>* Generally, the main part of the structure of a scientific article consists of subsections/subtitles: Introduction, Related Work or Literature Review, Research Methodology, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. Therefore, the authors must readjust the structure of the manuscript subsections following general standards in reputable scientific articles</p> <p>Note: Please adjust all writing formats in your manuscript by following the standard or draft format of the intended journal.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Please cite Table 1 in the text body of your paper.* Please cite Table 2 in the text body of your paper* The presentation of Table 2 must be on the same page. Please revise/rearrange it.* In the Conclusion subsection, authors no longer need to conduct other discussions except discussing the findings of the research (answering research objectives), the novelties found from your research results, and suggestions for further study. Please revise	
--	---	--

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:	Anthony Anggrawan
Department, University & Country	Bumigora University, Indonesia