

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126885
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Local Community Members' Participation in Schools' Managerial Activities and Decisions Making: A Case of Community Secondary Schools in Coast and Kagera Regions, Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it examines the essential role of community involvement in educational governance. By analysing community engagement in school management and decision-making, the research highlights its influence on school effectiveness and educational outcomes. This study is noteworthy for addressing a recurrent issue in community education, offering valuable insights that can shape educational policy and practice while promoting community engagement in resource-limited environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article appears to be somewhat lengthy. A more concise alternative that captures the essence of the study could be: "Community Participation in School Management: Insights from Secondary Schools in Tanzania's Coast and Kagera Regions."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract has to provides a comprehensive overview of the study, covering the purpose, methodology, findings, and implications. However, it could benefit from some adjustments for clarity and conciseness. Here are my suggestions: 1. Clarify Objectives: Explicitly state the main objective or research question at the beginning to enhance clarity. 2. Enhance Structure: Use clearer transitions between sections (objectives, methods, findings, implications) for better flow. 3. Reduce Redundancy: Remove phrases that are repetitive or wordy for a more concise summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsections are currently insufficient to cover all relevant areas, and reorganization is recommended. Suggestions for Improvement: - Introduction: The introduction section typically outlines the research problem, context, objectives, and significance of the study, providing a foundational understanding of the research scope. It is advisable to break this section into subsections due to its length. - Results and Discussions: If the results section is extensive or involves complex data, consider separating it from the discussion. This separation can improve clarity, allowing for a focused presentation of the findings followed by a thorough interpretation. - Logical Flow: It's important to verify that each subsection logically connects to the preceding one, facilitating a smooth progression for the reader throughout the manuscript. A few revisions could enhance the readability and clarity of this article.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript intends to convey scientific robustness and technical soundness through its structure. However, it lacks to present a solid methodology, adequate citation practices, and in-depth analysis. While the authors utilize established research techniques that enhance the reliability and validity of their findings, a more thorough literature review and contextual background would better support the study's rationale. There is significant room for improvement, and revisions could enhance both clarity and overall impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention	The manuscript has too few references for a research article. Increasing the number of recent and relevant sources would enhance its credibility and engagement with the literature. It is recommended adding more	

Review Form 3

them in the review form. :	contemporary studies, reviews, and key texts from reputable journals to improve the literature review.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article appears to be generally well-communicated.	
Optional/General comments	It is recommended to conduct a slight revision, rearrange the content, and ensure proper citations. Please take into account the comments provided.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramesh Kumar KC
Department, University & Country	Lincoln University College, Nepal