

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 <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.	This manuscript addresses significant issues in the area of social policy studies. The methodology section has been described in detail and the discussions have been carried out clearly. As a whole, this manuscript fits the scope of the journal and contains satisfactory academic rigour and relevance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate.	
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.	As already reiterated earlier, the steps for systematic review have been described well. This has led to a well-written discussion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and a few are rather current.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are a few errors in language; not many but noticeable. Proofreading is suggested.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	A manuscript that is recommended for publication after proofreading.	

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:	Syazliyati Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia