

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_101152
Title of the Manuscript:	A LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND GENDER ENROLMENT, INCLUSIVE EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT FUNDING, AND GRADUATE MARKETABILITY IN RWANDA AND TANZANIA
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? Esi a significant contribution to the teaching and management profession Influence of managers on the teaching profession of their establishments</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? The Title Is According To The Article, A Precise Title To The Development Of The Article</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete? It Is Well Developed, And Gives Us The Idea Of What We Will Read In The Article</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? It Is A Very Well Developed Manuscript, With Subtitles That Guide Deeper Ideas Of The Text</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Fully</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. Comply With The Minimum of What Is Suggested, Well</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Jose Manuel Salum Tome
Department, University & Country	Universidad Catolica De Temuco, Chile