

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100983
Title of the Manuscript:	Strategic Planning in Education: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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>)

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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community and will contribute to the existing knowledge.</p> <p>2. The title of the article suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article was not well written. Abstracts should be written in prose, without sub-titles; and should include the Aim, Research Design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion sub-titled in the Abstract should be expunged, unless it is the Journal's special style of presenting Abstracts.</p> <p>4. Sub-sections should be included, as highlighted in blue. This is a review paper. The method should be presented in passive form (see the corrections as highlighted in yellow). Title of a Figure is always written below the Figure, while title of a Table is written above the Table (see corrections). For coherence and flow of information, Tables should be inserted immediately they are introduced; else all the Tables should come as indices. However, for a review paper like this, the former is more appropriate. Do the needful on the arrangement of the Tables. Re-present the write-up <i>highlighted in red</i> in passive form (use the form on 2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria highlighted in yellow). Note that foreign words like <i>etc, et al</i>, should be always italicized. Note the correction on the way Tables and Figures could be introduced before presenting them. Full meanings of acronyms should be stated at first instance, not latter, e.g. (SWOT) Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. It is logical, coherent and convincing.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent, but followed no particular Referencing style. Initially, it suggested APA (in-text), however, at the Reference section, it was not APA since they were numbered and names of the first authors not alphabetically arranged, with the names and volumes of the Journals not italicized, <i>etc</i>. There should be consistency in the Referencing style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, the grammatical points should be re-visited. The method should be presented in passive form (see the corrections as highlighted in yellow) I think, in all sections, it needs proofreading again. Some of the grammatical points have been corrected and highlighted in Yellow and red colours. Include the sub-headings, as highlighted in blue.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper was well articulated and contributes to existing knowledge.</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:	Ehirim, Appolinus Ikechi
Department, University & Country	Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education, Nigeria