

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_104453
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Service Innovation in Barru District
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.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>Yes, it contributes to public service innovation. The contribution through interview excerpts is a good idea.</p> <p>Author should modify as: "Public Service Innovation in Barru District: A qualitative investigation"</p> <p>The Abstract objective and findings are clear, however, how it relates to public policy is unclear. So the focus should be on public service only.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The Introduction needs to be thoroughly revised to remove emphasis on public policy and shift to public service innovation. Methods section should enumerate how many people were contacted for interview and what positions they held. Literature review is missing which will summarize extant literature in public service innovation and gaps in the same which have been addressed by this work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>At some places, sentences do not make sense, and seem crowded. So, an English proof reading will be helpful.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Introduction needs to be thoroughly revised to remove emphasis on public policy and shift to public service innovation. Methods section should enumerate how many people were contacted for interview and what positions they held. Literature review is missing which will summarize extant literature in public service innovation and gaps in the same which have been addressed by this work.</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:	Shivinder Nijjer
Department, University & Country	Chitkara Business School, Chitkara University, India