

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_101471
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Management Capacity of University Administrators as a Predictor of Quality Assurance in Federal Universities in North East Geo-Political Zone, Nigeria</i>
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 <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>1. Manuscript is of a decent importance for scientific community. It does not bring breaking findings, only confirms those of others. However, the confirmation alone, and the fact that it applies to local Nigerian universities validates its relevance. Article could be more in depth, specifically in terms of data analysis and interpretation.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <p>Amongst minor shortcomings these ought to be highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absent reason of the study (why this topic in the first place); • Lack of clarity in Methodology part; • Grammar; • Minor discrepancy in the manuscript (Introduction mentions Objective, Research Question and a Hypothesis; in Methodology author is writing about three 	

Review Form 1.7

	questions and three hypotheses; however, it proceeds with one question and hypothesis – as in introduction).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Minor grammar revision recommended. Most common mistakes: punctuation, specifically commas – most frequent; wording – frequent; syntax/sentence structure – occasional; incorrect form of verb when the subject is third person and also when it's not – frequent.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martina Blašková
Department, University & Country	Police Academy of the Czech Republic, Czechia