

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126970
Title of the Manuscript:	Chaos and Decision Making in Schools and Other Educational Institutions
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The article captures the current situation bedeviling schools and if well-handled can generate solutions to chaos in institutions of learning. I detest the jumbled up information that has no basis arranged in some subheadings. Arrange your work in the prescribed format and proceed sequentially. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>-The current title is not plausible. Revise as follows below:</p> <p>Influence of chaos in the decision making process of schools and other educational institutions of The title should also include the level of schools (Primary/secondary/teacher training colleges etc)</p>	
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.	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive. Make your abstract stand out by including the necessary components as suggested.</p> <p>-The abstract is the executive summary of the document. It should summarise all the Aspects of the document ie the objective(s), methodology, results, data analysis, conclusions and recommendations</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are not. The researcher should include the following: Introduction; Statement of the problem; objective; Literature Review; Conceptual framework; Methodology; Results and data analysis; Conclusion; Recommendations	
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.	-With necessary revisions, the work will be scientifically robust. The work needs to be systematic and have a clear objective and statement of the problem, followed by literature review indicating gaps, data analysis etc	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The references are sufficient. However, they are old. There is a need for the author to revise them appropriately to maintain currency ie not more than eight years from now (2017 onwards) -Single spacing for references to be upheld in the reference section -Ensure all references are captured in the reference section ie Robins and Judge page 3 missing - Use APA consistently. Familiarize yourself with APA 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-The language has to be improved upon. Grammatical mistakes to be eliminated and correct spacing adhered to	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work can still be published if the major corrections are worked on.	

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:	Kenneth Sabwami
Department, University & Country	Mount Kenya University, Kenya