

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The manuscript is addressing a subject relevant to the scientific community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title of the article is appropriate</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is not comprehensive. It should include the methodology eg sample size, data collection</b></p> <p>4. <b>The methodology section is missing, how was data collected and analysed?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Without clear methodology, the paper's scientific correctness is in question</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are not up to date. The issues under study should be traced up to the current studies, otherwise most of the studies cited are not current</b></p> <p>The manuscript is good but be improved to meet scientific standards. References should follow APA style.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is fairly good</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>When you decide to put data for sample institutions, then do it for both countries and justify the choice of those institutions</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saul Mubanda Muyiggwa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Graduate School, Bugema University, Uganda</b>