

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	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 '**Jack 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</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 has had a great impact on the scientific community. I have a very important scientific insight	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate	
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 very comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 used is clear and easy to understand, making the study accessible. Additionally, the research questions and hypotheses are well-defined, and the authors have applied appropriate statistical tests to support their findings effectively and reliably.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the article is excellent	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Zaliza Md Yasin
Department, University & Country	University Malaya, Malaysia