

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_118851
Title of the Manuscript:	A Systematic Review of Financial Resource Management in Education
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript "A Systematic Review of Financial Resource Management in Education" is important for the scientific community as it provides a thorough analysis of the financial challenges and practices in educational management. Its systematic approach, global reach, and practical recommendations make it a valuable resource for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners dedicated to improving the financial sustainability and quality of educational institutions.</p> <p>While the current title is effective and suitable, the following suggested alternatives can potentially provide a more detailed preview of the article's scope, findings, and significance, making it more appealing and informative to prospective readers:</p> <p>1. "Global Challenges and Practices in Financial Resource Management in Education: A Systematic Review": This title emphasizes the global perspective and highlights the key areas of challenges and practices covered in the review.</p> <p>2. "A Systematic Review of Challenges, Practices, and Recommendations in Financial Resource Management in Education": This title is comprehensive and informative, capturing the systematic approach and the triad of focus areas (challenges, practices, recommendations) discussed in the paper.</p> <p>3. "Navigating Financial Resource Management in Education: A Systematic Review of Global Perspectives and Practices": This title suggests a more dynamic approach ("Navigating") and includes both the global and practical elements of the review.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive. It succinctly outlines the purpose of the study, which is to explore financial management challenges and practices in educational institutions. It clearly describes the methodology, mentioning the use of the PRISMA framework for systematic review and the criteria for selecting the studies included in the analysis. The abstract also summarizes the key findings by highlighting the main challenges (limited funds, inadequate training, and budget misappropriation) and practices (budget planning, procedures, reporting, empowerment, and partnerships) identified in the review.</p> <p>The structure and subsections are well-organized and appropriate for a systematic review. The paper follows a logical flow, beginning with an introduction that sets the context and outlines the significance of financial resource management in education. This is followed by a detailed methodology section explaining the PRISMA framework and the criteria used for selecting studies. The results are presented clearly, with subsections dedicated to the identified challenges and practices in financial resource management. Finally, the discussion and conclusion effectively synthesize the findings and provide practical recommendations. This structured approach ensures clarity and facilitates a comprehensive understanding of the topic.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It employs the PRISMA framework for conducting a systematic review, which is a widely accepted and rigorous methodology in research.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is formal and clear, adhering to academic standards, and effectively conveys complex concepts related to financial management in education. However, there are occasional instances where sentence structure could be simplified and technical jargon more clearly defined to enhance readability. Minor grammatical improvements and stylistic refinements would further polish the text and make it more accessible to a broader academic audience.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hardi Abdul Rahaman
Department, University & Country	Tamale Islamic Science Senior High School, Ghana