

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_118446
Title of the Manuscript:	Chaining Strategy and Language Comprehension Development among Deaf Pupils in Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>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>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. The author needs to reconceptualize and think again of the model of methodology. Focusing on the objective will make better line to connect the methodology with the objective. If the author believes to research 'usefulness', with what parameters and indicators it is determined? Also, we have not found any quantitative tackle the author carried out and wrote in the manuscript. On the other hand, please comply with 'how' do you calculate and identify 'usefulness' using questionnaire? What aspects are applied in the questionnaire? What topic did you ask your respondent to fill out?</p> <p>6. Updated reference: OK.</p>	<p>1.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Focus on methodology → update your abstract → add certain keyword indicating SDGs that still has a link with your issue "deaf".</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Achmad Naufal Irsyadi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia