

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_103362</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Contributions of fee-free education in secondary schools towards student's academic progress in Iringa Municipal</b>
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 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The problem this report tries to investigate is very important. However, as I shall explain in the next items, this manuscript has important failures that question its quality.</li> <li>The title announces the study of relationship between fee-free education and student's academic progress. In the text, "progress" is treated as synonymous of "performance". Al along the manuscript, the are no mention about how this relationship was studied. Not a word is said about how the second one was defined, and the first one is presented only by a historic register that describes periods of application of politics of fee-free education. Besides, methodological design uses a qualitative model, that only takes into account opinions of participants. An alternative title could be "Perceptions of heads of schools, teachers, parents and students about relevance of fee-free education".</li> <li>No. It doesn't describe methodology used, presents suggestions that don't follow from the study, and no mention is made about how student's academic progress was determined.</li> <li>Structure can be improved. When describing methodology, authors could have given more information (contents of semi structured interviews, topics proposed in session of focus groups, role of different participants in focus groups or interviews, the process of triangulation, among others). Besides, subtitles from Research Design to Ethical Considerations are of different hierarchies (some of them are subordinated to others) but this is not explicit because of notation system adopted. Substituting this system for another one that makes clear dependence relations between these subsections would make easier for readers to understand.</li> <li>No. It has a main failure, which is trying to stablish the effects of implementation of a certain educational politic over a variable whose nature is quantitative (student's progress or performance) using a qualitative methodology. Answering first research question needs a clear definition of variable "student's academic progress", and a way to measure its changes that could be related with the implementation of fee-free education. Besides, there are some incoherences in the report. When describing population, authors mention that five heads of school were selected, but there is not further information about which was their participation in the study. Similarly, in Research Design subsection authors say that parents and students should be participant in focus groups, but in Population and Sampling subsection not a word is said about how they were selected. In both cases, some of their responses appears in Results and Discussion subsection. On another side, second research question answers consist of a list of suggestions that are not based upon evidence gathered in any of the instances of data collection.</li> <li>Yes, they are.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>There some punctuation mistakes (see, for example, paragraph under the subtitle Population and sampling or second paragraph of section responding to research question 2)</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It seems that authors have made a lot of work collecting data and processing them according to a qualitative research design. In my opinion, this work is worth to be communicated in a way coherent with the design adopted.</p> <p>In order to achieve this objective, I suggest at least four modifications or adds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change first research question and declare that the report refers to opinions of participants.</li> <li>Present justifications to answers of research question 2.</li> <li>Explain in detail the procedures followed for triangulating data, coding and other processes developed for analysing data.</li> <li>Argue about the recommendations, justifying them in testimonies from focus groups or interviews.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Catholic University of Uruguay, Uruguay</b>