

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128125
Title of the Manuscript:	The Western Aid To Africa In Xxi Country: A Neocolonial Approach Deciphering The Neocolonial Socioeconomic Realities And Effects
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes to the scientific community as it critically examines the enduring effects of neocolonialism in Africa through the lens of Western aid dynamics. By linking historical colonial practices with contemporary socio-economic challenges, it provides a nuanced understanding of how aid perpetuates dependency and exploitation. The inclusion of detailed case studies enhances its relevance, offering empirical insights into the systemic issues faced by nations like Congo, Angola, Mozambique, Sudan, and Nigeria. The work enriches theoretical frameworks for analyzing post-colonial relations, advancing academic discourse and interdisciplinary studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is lengthy, which can make it less memorable. A more concise title would be easier for readers to grasp quickly (The title emphasizes both "Western aid" and "Neocolonial approach," which are central themes of the paper. Hence alternative title may be: "Neocolonial Dynamics of Western Aid and Its Socioeconomic Impacts on African Countries in the 21st Century")	
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 of the article is generally comprehensive, clearly outlining the focus, scope, and key arguments.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically grounded and aligns well with existing literature on neocolonialism. However, addressing the areas for improvement will enhance its academic rigor and credibility. The manuscript focuses heavily on the negative aspects of Western aid. While this is valid for the neocolonial critique, acknowledging any positive impacts or counter-arguments could improve objectivity. Briefly discuss whether there are cases where aid has contributed positively to sustainable development or governance reform.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a substantial number of references that provide historical and theoretical grounding for the discussion of neocolonialism and Western aid to Africa.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article employs a formal tone that is suitable for scholarly writing. The use of academic terms like "neocolonialism," "dependency systems," and "elite capture" reflects familiarity with the subject matter. Ideas are organized logically, moving from historical context to contemporary case studies and concluding with proposed solutions.	
Optional/General comments	The paper provides insightful critiques and historical analysis, it could benefit from the inclusion of more recent empirical data, such as updated statistics or recent case studies, to strengthen its arguments and relevance in contemporary policy debates.	

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:	Birendra Narayan Shah
Department, University & Country	Gangseo University, South Korea