

**Review Form 1.8**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_120022</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Strategies for Resource Management in the Department of Education: A Systematic Review of Efficiency and Effectiveness</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 1.8

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i></p>	<p>Yes. It provides an overview of key information that emerged from several studies to inform stakeholders including policymakers on the key aspects to consider for effective and efficient resource management and sustainability. However, there are few things that need to be considered and reworked, such as the reliability and validity of the sample used, the analysis, details of how the PICOS paradigm was used, and the citations principles. He manuscript has the potential, but some major changes are needed.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes. However, there is a need to differentiate the terms efficiency and effectiveness in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p>	<p>The abstract is well structured, but the following concerns, if addressed, will add value to the it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sample size of only 19 papers may be too limited leading to bias and generalisation of the findings. A larger sample might be used.</li> <li>2. The abstract could at least mention that selection of papers is based on a set of criteria which has been detailed later in the paper.</li> <li>3. The abstract highlights that several resource management approaches were assessed but there is no details of the comparative analysis, which makes it difficult to understand the efficacy of different strategies was measured and compared.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i></p>	<p>Yes. However, clearer and more systematic approaches towards showcasing the use of meta-analysis and meta-synthesis approaches would have made more justice to the important research focus, that is resource management strategies and sustainability.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Recent yes but not used in an academic manner in several sections (e.g introduction). Need to review author's citations style.</p>	

**Review Form 1.8**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Good enough though proofreading is needed, especially to review some sentence structures.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research questions, introduction, and search strategy well-structured and coherent.</li> <li>• There are some discrepancies which have been noted and need to be addressed:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the methodology section, it is stated that 'This section describes the methodology used <b>to assess resource management methods</b> within the Department of Education', while in the abstract reference is made to 'explores the efficiency and efficacy of the Department of Education's <b>resource management strategies</b>, with an emphasis on budgetary planning, technological integration, and policy execution'. In resource management scholarship, there is a need to differentiate between the technical terms' methods and strategies. There is a need to be consistent</li> <li>2. 1<sup>st</sup> exclusion criterion refers to exclude 'studies published before 2019-2024'. This literally means you will use only 2024 publications.</li> <li>3. The inclusion and exclusion criteria used are not from referenced sources. For reliability and validity purposes, it is better to use scholarly criteria used by other researchers in the same field, though few contextualized criteria can be included. what is the reason (or justification) for not using 'non-empirical studies, reviews, meta-analyses' when those can be valuable sources.</li> <li>4. Grey literature in inclusion list while in exclusion list, you stated 'books, dissertations, theses, opinion pieces' which are often reliable peer-reviewed sources.</li> <li>5. Limited databases used (ERIC and Google Scholar) and no mention of the non-relevant databases.</li> <li>6. Efficiency, efficacy and effectiveness are all important concepts in management, performance and evaluation, but they refer to different aspects and have their own specificities in relation to resource management and sustainability. There is a need to provide the necessary information to readers and used the relevant terms which allow those nuances to emerge</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Though the information given in Table 2, such as authorship, publication year, country of origin, discipline, sample size, can be given the focus of the study is to compare, assess .... The resource management strategies, isn't it? So why so much focus on country of origin, authorship or whether qualitative or quantitative or mixed method used. The focus should have been on the research emphasis, the resources management etc as per your research questions. A meta-synthesis is more appropriate here than a meta-analysis only.</li> <li>• The section on analysis is not well detailed and information given therein remains repetitive.</li> <li>• There is a need to reflect on the use of table 3 for this study which focuses on research management strategies. Is the methodology used I the study key in terms of resource management strategies. Does this genuinely make a difference. If yes, how?</li> <li>• The section results and discussion are powerful with key information and well presented.</li> <li>• There is a need to proofread the whole manuscript. Some language issues have been noted.</li> <li>• There is also a need to standardise the way citations are included in the</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.8**

	text. Several discrepancies noted.	
--	------------------------------------	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Atchia Mohammad Shakeel Cassam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mauritius Institute of Education, Mauritius</b>