

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_109098
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DISTRIBUTION POLICY OF NON-CASH FOOD ASSISTANCE IN THE SENDANA SUB-DISTRICT OF PALOPO CITY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript offers various potential importance to the scientific community such as basis for policy analysis, implementation evaluation, and planning for budget and analysis. However, there are some areas for improvement. To enhance the impact of the manuscript in the scientific community, the author may consider presenting qualitative data from the result of the examination and evaluation of documents to enhance the scientific rigor of the manuscript. Also, to enhance the credibility of the results, the author may strengthen the discussion with some references so support the claim.</li> <li>2. The title is suitable for the aim of the study.</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive but the author may consider improving the text for clarity.</li> <li>4. The sections of the paper seem to be following the IMRAD format.</li> <li>5. The paper is scientifically correct but the author may consider comment number 1 to improve the overall quality of the paper.</li> <li>6. Additional references may be added to support comment number 1</li> <li>7. Please improve the reference list. Please adhere to the paper guidelines.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The presentation of the paper is good but the author may still consider to seek guidance/expertise of other English editors.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cris Norman P. Olipas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Information and Communications Technology, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines</b>