

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_96457
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC STATUS AND PERSISTENT DEFILEMENT CASES IN THARAKA NITHI COUNTY, KENYA
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes. The manuscript discusses a very important issue that will be a good read. 2. The title looks good 3. The first two sentences in the abstract mean the same thing. Let us know the issue as stated in sentence 1, how you went about the investigation, what you found, and perhaps your recommendation. All these should not exceed 250 words. 4. This reviewer suggests some additions to the sections. For instance, what theory explains this phenomenon? There should be a theoretical review or a literature review or both. 5. Scientifically, the manuscript is correct. 6. References are good. OTHERS The author used a phenomenological design with 70 participants. This design is qualitative. One wonders what went into the interviews since the findings look more like a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data gathered via a concurrent mixed methods approach. Please take a second look at this. Also, the discussion of the empirical findings has no link with the theoretical literature. It is important to do this. From the methodology section to the end of the manuscript looks more journalistic than academic.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Copy editing is required	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	George Asekere
Department, University & Country	University of Education, Ghana