

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126964
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Security Policy in Tanzania: A Review of Benefits, Challenges and Effectiveness
Type of the Article	Review 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This article deals with the social security policy in Tanzania. It highlights the benefits, challenges and effectiveness of this policy. It can be an important manuscript for the social activists and policy makers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable for investigation. The title is direct and clear.	
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 needs the addition of some information.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are ok according to the nature of the 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.	The language is good. Ideas are clearly mentioned. It follows the format of the journal article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, but they do not follow the APA Style. The author needs to follow this style.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language is good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Lok Raj Sharma
Department, University & Country	Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Nepal