

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_117385
Title of the Manuscript:	4PS BENEFICIARIES' CHARACTERISTICS AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE: IMPLICATIONS ON THEIR LIVING CONDITIONS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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, this manuscript has the potential to be significant for the scientific community. Particularly, those interested in social welfare programs and poverty reduction strategies. It investigates the connection between the characteristics of beneficiaries, program compliance, and living conditions in the context of the 4Ps program in the Philippines. This research can contribute to understanding the effectiveness of such programs and inform their improvement.</p> <p>2. The current title is somewhat lengthy. A more concise and informative title is suggested, for example: The Impact of 4Ps Program Compliance on Beneficiary Living Conditions</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a good overview of the study's aims, methodology, and key findings. It mentions the research gap and the program's goals. It could benefit from explicitly stating the hypothesis and significance of the findings.</p> <p>4. The structure with separate sections for Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion seems appropriate.</p> <p>5. While the overall approach seems sound, a thorough review by experts familiar with the 4Ps program and social welfare research methods is recommended to ensure the research design, data analysis, and interpretation are scientifically rigorous.</p> <p>6. The references seem relevant but consider including more recent studies (within the last 5 years) on the 4Ps program's impact and similar conditional cash transfer programs. Here are some additional suggestions for recent references:</p> <p>Abrahams, D., & Hidrobo, M. F. (2021). The long-term impacts of conditional cash transfers on human capital: Evidence from Colombia's Familias en Acción program. Journal of Development Economics, 152, 102593.</p> <p>Basso, G., & Mantovani, C. (2020). The causal impact of a conditional cash transfer program on children's human capital: Evidence from Argentina's Jefes y Jefas program. World Development, 130, 104890.</p> <p>Additional comments: The reviewer acknowledges the strengths of this manuscript: 1. The research examines a relevant topic by exploring the impact of a social welfare program on the living conditions of its beneficiaries. 2. The study clearly aims to investigate whether program compliance affects living conditions. 3. The manuscript follows a logical structure with clear sections. 4. The study employs statistical methods to analyse the data.</p> <p>Recommendations: 1. The abstract could explicitly state the hypothesis being tested. 2. Addressing potential ethical concerns or competing interests can significantly</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	strengthen the overall quality and impact of the research. 3. The discussion might benefit from acknowledging potential limitations of the study, such as sample size and generalisability. 4. The manuscript could benefit from minor editing to improve grammar and clarity.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The language is generally good, but some minor grammatical errors and phrasing issues might need correction during editing for a scholarly publication.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript has a good foundation and explores a relevant topic. Addressing the recommendations above can strengthen the scientific merit and clarity of the research.	

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:	Wendy Smidt
Department, University & Country	Global Institute for Teacher Education and Society, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa