

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_94965
Title of the Manuscript:	SCHOOL FEEDING: IS THE GHANA EDUCATION SERVICE NECESSARY IN ITS OPERATIONS?
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are problems in the operation of an important school feeding program in Ghana. It is important to present scientifically what these problems are and suggestions for solutions. 2. The title of the article is not appropriate. It can be suggested that the title should be as follows; Problems in the operations of the school feeding programme in Ghana 3. Is the summary of the article not comprehensive? In the summary, it is understood that the Ghana Education Service (GES) was directly responsible for the poor execution of the school nutrition program and a biased judgment was reached. In the summary, the explanation of how the study was carried out is insufficient. 4. In the introduction of the article, it is stated that the Ghana education service needs to take responsibility for all education programs in order to ensure quality formal education and training is provided to all Ghanaian school-age children, and that the task of the Ghana Education Service (GES) is to oversee the implementation of the education programs envisaged in the 2008 Law No. 778. . The situation stated as a problem is why GES is not at the forefront of school feeding operations despite its constitutional authority. The reason for this is the negligence of the Ghana education service (GES) in fulfilling its constitutional duties to administer the school nutrition program. However, it is also noted that when the Ghana education service is given full authority to run the program, accountability in school feeding program operations can be improved. It is already an institution with constitutional authority and neglects its duty. In this case it is mentioned why it is necessary to replace the district council and school supply secretariat with the Ghana education service. Isn't the main problem that GES does not fulfill its duty? Is not it a dilemma? In the introduction, the functioning of the school nutrition program in Ghana and the problems experienced should be explained objectively and the problem situation should be written with the support of the literature. There are major problems in the method part of the article. The following questions need to be answered? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the research method used? (Quantitative, qualitative or mixed) • Which method was used to determine the population and sample? • How were the schools included in this study determined? • How were the teachers who answered the survey determined? • Who was the interview with? How many people was it made with? How were these people identified? What were the interview questions? • What, when and where was the observation made? • How were observation reports kept? • It is stated that the questions are sensitive and political in nature. It is mentioned that many of the participants had reservations when answering questions about how and why in the selection procedure. How was the approval and security of the participants ensured so that the answers could be received in an unbiased and objective way? • How was the analysis of the data done? Explanatory information about the analysis is needed. • What is the percentage distribution of respondents to the survey questions? 5. Since there are inadequacies in the explanation of the problem situation in the introduction and in the method section, it does not seem possible to interpret the findings and discussion section. In this way the article cannot be considered scientific 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Filiz Yurtal
Department, University & Country	Çukurova University, Turkey