

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_127588
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INFLUENCE OF STRATEGIC ANALYSIS PRACTICES ON SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN TANZANIA: A REFLECTION TO THE STRATEGIC PLANNING MODEL
Type of the 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is educative. 2. It is adding new knowledge in the world of academia. 3. The topic is researchable. 4. It is using current citations. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is researchable. However, the topic is long. I would suggest it be reduced to 20 words or less. E.g. by removing the article at the beginning as guided.	
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 is well done. However, it can be improved by including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Target population. b. Results of testing of hypotheses. c. Then check the grammar. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate. I would suggest your summarise the whole manuscript. Remove the theories used.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is precise i.e. objectives, thoroughness, exact language is used. 2. It has clarity 3. It is subjected to peer reviews. 4. Primary audience. It includes information that applies to the audience and is easy to understand. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments	The language need to be improved by addressing the issues of grammar.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Please read through your work and address the issues raised and the grammar.	

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:	Jeremiah Mulinge Kawinzi
Department, University & Country	South Eastern Kenya University, Kenya