

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_120462</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EXPLORING INTRACACIES OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COLLABORATION IN MANAGING SCHOOL DISCIPLINE: A CASE OF SELECTED SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN CHINGOLA DISTRICT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>* The topic of the study is important in the scientific community because the educational institution indeed need the collaboration of the community or stakeholders in providing quality education for the learners. It is interesting that the author touched the topic of school discipline, deviating from the normal concern which is academic performance. Discipline does not really starts in school, but at home, and therefore, the collaboration of school and community is vital.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>* The title "...Intracacies..." should have been "...Intricacies..."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>* The abstract should have started with what is happening at present and what should happen, and not the focus of the study. * The abstract does not clearly separate the quantitative findings from the qualitative ones.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>* The Statement of the Problem only contains one word which is the main concern of the exploration. It is suggested to the author to list the specific questions that the study have sought to answer.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>* The number of respondents for the qualitative part of the study was mentioned (113), but the number of participants for the qualitative part was not mentioned. This should be revealed.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>* Simba, et al., 2016, and Njoroge and Nyabuto, 2014 found on page 1 are not found in the Reference list. * Nyabuto and Njoroge, 2014 and Simba, et al., 2016 are not found in the Reference list. The author is advised to have a thorough look at all the in-text citations, and check them over in the reference list if they are found there. *Referencing format does not following the latest APA style. The title of the article should not be italicized. Also, only the first word should be capitalized; succeeding proper nouns and word after the colon are to be capitalized. The source journal shall be italicized. * Bless and Achola, 1988 found in methodology portion is not found in the Reference list.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>* For the qualitative part, the author is suggested to have themes developed, probably for every question cluster of questions answered by participants. Themes can be short phrase or simple sentence that represent all or most of the answers of the participants on every question or cluster of questions.</p> <p>* A Conclusion portion is strongly advised. This can be one or two paragraphs that would reveal the answers to the problem posted at the beginning of the study. Recommendation portion is also an important part that should be added, in order to call targeted person or group of persons for specific action related to the findings in the study.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b>comments</p>	<p>* The simple discussion of skewness and kurtosis in tables 1 and 2 are appreciated. The author is commended for this.</p> <p>* The author is saluted for having both internal and external analysis in the discussion of findings.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b><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></p>
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Elymar A. Pascual</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Philippines</b></p>