

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_94989
Title of the Manuscript:	Participatory budgeting and its impact on the social development of a city in Peru
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> <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>See general comments, it could be.</p> <p>I would recommend changing form "... in a city in Peru" to "... Trujillo, Peru"</p> <p>The abstract is too detailed and does not clearly identify the main findings. It also does not say why the reader should find the results useful.</p> <p>Although there are only limited structural elements (subsections), I have no specific recommendations.</p> <p>See general comments, it could be.</p> <p>The references appear adequate, but I defer to other reviewers.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The text is adequately English; however, it is ponderous, which suggests a lack of fluency. This may reflect a cultural difference in the expectations of academic articles, but I don't think that is the source.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper asserts that it examines the link between participatory budgeting and social development. See general comments. This might be scientifically interesting if it provided a clear statement of the meaning of “social development.” The definition should be offered near the beginning and should be conceptual before it moves on to referencing external technical standards. With respect to external technical standards, the indexes should be cited to sources and the relationship between the index and the income data should be clarified.</p> <p>Assuming that these problems are resolved, Table 1 appears to indicate that 5 officials of each of eleven districts were asked to respond to a survey and that there was a 100% response rate. If this is so, it should be said. Obtaining a 100% response rate is considered remarkable, so likely there should be an explanation (Was the survey response required by higher ranking officials? Is response to this sort of survey a common cultural expectation in Peru? Were several attempts made to find a respondent in some categories/districts?)</p> <p>Tables 2 and 5 through 12 specify results of logit models, but there is no clear declaration (formula/expressions) that show the independent and dependent variables for each of the 9 models. The reader is left trying to trouble the models out from the text. The text is not adequately helpful as it spends more space on formulaic language about why the p-value is adequate than it does explaining the model. This would appear to require substantial rewriting.</p> <p>Overall, the paper does not explain why participatory budgeting should have the effects that are possibly explained by the model.</p> <p>It is concerning that the apparent dependent variables are survey responses from individuals who may have a professional risk associated with failed implementation of participatory budgeting.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniel Williams
Department, University & Country	Baruch College, City University of New York, United States