

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97421
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges facing women vegetable vendors in Arusha, Tanzania. A case of Tengeru market.
Type of the Article	Short 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important for scientific community. No, it has to be modified as “Women vegetable vendors face challenges in Arusha, Tanzania. A case study of the Tengeru market No, the abstract has to be modified. I suggest that the following can be maintained as an abstract of this manuscript. The study aims to analyze the obstacles that women vegetable vendors face in Arusha, Tanzania, with a focus on Tengeru market. The cross-sectional research design was adopted in this study. A case study, as opposed to a broad statistical survey, focuses on a specific circumstance. It refers to the process of getting an understanding of a topic without including the entire population. The survey's findings showed that the majority of respondents were female due to the nature of the study, were in their 21s to 25s, and had only completed primary education. The study's findings again showed that the majority of respondents sold vegetables in their community local markets to generate revenue. Also, the majority of these people were participating in vegetable vending activities due to persuasion from their families, spouses, local government officials, societal seminars, and other groups. Furthermore, it was found that few individuals claimed that the income they were generating from their activities was insufficient to satisfy their households' requirements or other socioeconomic activities. The study discovered that vegetable vendors experienced a variety of difficulties, including a lack of support from the government, a lack of support from their families, a lack of confidence, a lack of skills and expertise, and gender-based violence that interfered with their activity. The study generally suggests that the government should offer loans to these women who work as vending employees, as well as create legislation and bylaws, raise awareness, and produce supportive materials. The subsections are OK. But there is a correction in the sub-section 3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents. The writing has to be changed into scholarly way of expressing the findings. It only talks of most of the respondents, but not qualified and mentioned in percentage. Kindly do that. Yes, it is scientifically correct. References are not sufficient to support the manuscript sufficiently. Therefore, it is better to provide more references to support and also justify the manuscript results. Moreover, the discussion section is not sufficient. It is better to discuss more. After the findings, the manuscript ends with conclusion. The author has to add Policy implication and recommendations. References are not mentioned as per the 7th APA edition. Kindly change them.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, It lacks scholarly writing and also the language has to be fine-tuned.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. John Kaviarasu
Department, University & Country	Loyola College , India