

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_102955
Title of the Manuscript:	CAREER MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES PRIORITIZATION ON IMPROVING SANGGUNIANG KABATAAN CHAIRPERSONS' RETENTION: A SPHERICAL FUZZY ANALYTIC HIERARCHY PROCESS-BASED APPROACH
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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The article seems well-written and of value. Here are four major points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Make the title shorter. Instead of the Philippines term for youth council, you might use the English in the title to improve searchability and use by others.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The methodology section is difficult to read. You start out with a brief overview and then develop a framework, and only in Section 2.6 do you actually get to the methodology and methods.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The methodology section is incomplete and needs clarified. You state early on you had 29 interviews. What is needed are the following: demographics on the sample and was it representative of the population (aids in generalizability and transferability); you state unstructured interviews—what does that mean and how accomplished (I suspect you had a deductive scheme with a highly-structured interview scheme); how was data recorded (e.g., field notes, recordings, etc.), how long were interviews, and an actual methodology (how was data analyzed to fit into the proposed scheme; how could an unstructured interview provide details for the entire framework?); what computer program did you use to analyze the data; did you check validity and reliability?; being unstructured, minor data points and outliers should exist and would improve your article).</b></li> <li>4. <b>You have a scale of 9 points, from absolutely lower importance to absolutely higher importance. How did one accurately delineate each category? What were the cutoff criteria? What was the difference between absolutely and very high? Is there a practical significance between each category? The extant literature suggests so many categories become indefensible and highly subjective. Still, you must explain how and what was done. This problem will harm your research unless explained and readers believe in your analysis.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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>David C. Coker</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Fort Hays State University, USA</b>