

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript is very important and significant for Tanzanian deaf students as well as other students and researchers.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The research topic is very good and suitable to this paper.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract is compressive and well written. The crux of the complete article is apparent in the abstract.</b></li> <li>4. <b>A subheading "Background of the Study" under the heading of "Introduction" should be removed as it is introduction of the study. However, there should be more subheadings having the "Problem Statement" and "Significance of the study". Delimitation is also very important for this kind of general studies.</b></li> <li>5. <b>There is a problem in Methodology section. The researcher mentioned more than 3 data collection tools as already mentioned in the abstract. However, the results are not accordingly mentioned in the results section. The researcher can review the methodology or can add all the results in the results section.</b></li> <li>6. <b>References are all fine, latest and sufficient.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>The conclusion and recommendations should be separate and the implication of the study should be added.</b></p>	
<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>	<p>Language quite good as an academic article.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There is a need to check the methodology and results and align them accordingly.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>Imran Nazeer</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Gujrat, Pakistan</b>