

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_96476
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS INFLUENCING YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN LEADERSHIP IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN IRINGA MUNICIPALITY, TANZANIA
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 '**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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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>1. The manuscript is not well-written and inundated with grammatical, mechanical, and stylistic errors that prevent readers from understanding the study.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate; however, important information is missing. For example, the recruitment and sampling procedures were missing. See my comments on the manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Most of the references were not cited in the body of the manuscript.</p> <p>Additional questions and recommendations for the author:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was your sample size determined? Please describe. • How were the informants recruited? • What was the response rate? • Did an institutional review board approve your study? • How many questions were in the survey instrument? • Did you use an existing instrument? • Or did you create the instrument yourself? • If you created your own instrument, did you pilot it for content validity? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Pearson correlation is used when assessing the relationship between two continuous variables. The non-parametric equivalent to the Pearson correlation is the Spearman correlation (ρ), and is more appropriate when at least one of the variables is measured on an ordinal scale. • At least you should test the normality of your data before using parametric statistics. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Unfortunately, the English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication. it was not well-written and inundated with grammatical, mechanical, and stylistic errors that prevent readers from understanding the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Tan Fung Ivan Chan
Department, University & Country	Barry University, USA