

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_108374
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenomenological Study of Budget Management at the Jambi City Education Office
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. This paper a lot of work to be improved and to accept for publication. Comments to the Author (Required): Thanks for letting me read and review this paper. - The presenting quality of this paper looks like a report rather than a research article. - Current title looks so big. Consider using a more specific title to enhance clarity. - Improve the Abstract's quality by organizing the content more effectively and using precise language. - Condense the literature review by summarizing studies more succinctly. - Present the model and its factors please. - Enhance clarity in presenting the results and policy implications. - Please correct the grammar of this article. - Please, explain the population size and the method of sampling more accurately. - Variables are missed or not clear mentioned. - The research model missed! Although the research gap is not clear to me, can you provide a clear explanation? - No clear results are found in this paper. - The importance of work is not clear. Please provide more descriptions to better understand readers. - Limitation needs more improvements. The authors have to write the limitation of this study clearly more than that. - The reviewed work's disadvantages should be mentioned in the related work, and a complete literature review should present mentioning the type (variety) of the study carried out. - in the Introduction section, some paragraphs are too long and should be more condensed. Some terms of shallow integration and deep integration should be clarified and referenced. - In addition, the authors might be considered to add one section on the current topic after the Literature review section. - I would suggest to the author(s) to compare their results with the results of similar works. - The "Method" section is not clearly presented. - In order to be replicated by other authors in their future research and to be very easy to understand by the readers. - I recommend the authors to present the main steps of the research methodology. This presentation must be accomplished only by theoretically point of view, with no other interferences. - Conclusions could focus only on answering the research objectives, not summarizing the results or discussions. - The number of references is quite limited, should add more references.</p> <p>Further revisions are necessary to improve the article's conciseness and precision.</p> <p>2. Yes. 3. No. 4. No. 5. Yes. Partly. 6. No.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. Please correct the grammar and spelling of this article. A professional English-language proofreader is advised before resubmission.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Nemer Badwan
Department, University & Country	Palestine Technical University, Palestine