

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_99488
Title of the Manuscript:	Issues, Problems and Challenges of Enhancing Social Functioning among Children with Cognitive Disabilities in Tanzania: A Theoretical Review
Type of the 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important, especially if annotations are acknowledged.</p> <p>Yes, and academically catching and inviting. Unfortunately, due to the status of the paper. I suggest the title to be changed to "A Theoretical review: An overview of social functioning among children with cognitive disabilities" It is not comprehensive enough.</p> <p>They are appropriate; however, they are overarched with no substance.</p> <p>It can be, with restructuring and focusing to a one certain point.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p> <p>Refocus the paper, it is far-fetched from Tanzania. It needs to engage with the area of study despite that it is leaning towards literature. The literature needs to speak to the African context in a robust researched manner. Clarity is needed because the paper circulates around with no focal point of departure.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is, however, an attention is needed in relation to generalisation and writing from a vacuum Point of view.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper needs a sound attitude and one spear headed point of view. Otherwise, it becomes a coffee table analogy. The paper is more clinging in unpacking terminologies of social workers, but without engaging with them in an interrogative manner and critically to find solutions or problems in social working climate of Tanzania.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Maxwell Rani
Department, University & Country	Centre for Theatre and Dance, Performance Studies, University of Cape Town, South Africa