

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_124516
Title of the Manuscript:	University Peer Mentoring Program: Perceptions and Expectations of Aspirants at BUAP, Mexico
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript contributes significantly to the scientific community by exploring the perceptions and expectations of students interested in joining a peer mentoring program in a Mexican university setting. The study's findings shed light on the importance of empathy, support, and guidance in facilitating students' adaptation to university life, thereby reducing dropout rates. By examining the Lobomentoría program's effectiveness, this research informs higher education institutions seeking to implement similar initiatives. The manuscript's focus on a Latin American context adds valuable diversity to the existing literature on mentoring programs</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title may benefit from refinement</p> <p>Suggested alternative:</p> <p>"Exploring Student Perceptions and Expectations of Peer Mentoring: A Study of the Lobomentoría Program at a Mexican University"</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarifies the study's focus on student perceptions and expectations. 2. Specify the context (Mexican university) and program (Lobomentoría). 3. Improves searchability and discoverability. <p>Alternative options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Student Perspectives on Peer Mentoring: The Lobomentoría Experience" 2. "Mentoring in Higher Education: Understanding Student Expectations and Perceptions". 3. "Lobomentoría Program Evaluation: Student Insights and Implications" 4. "Peer Mentoring in Mexico: Exploring Student Perceptions and Program Effective 	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider rephrasing the first sentence to focus on the study's main objective. 2. Specify the number of participants and/or response rate. 3. Highlight the most significant findings or implications. 4. Ensure abstract conforms to journal guidelines (word count, structure). <p>Revised Abstract:</p> <p>"Exploring Perceptions and Expectations of University Peer Mentors: A Mixed-Methods Study</p> <p>This study investigates the readiness and preparation of applicants seeking to join the Lobomentoría peer mentoring program at the Complejo Regional Nororiental of BUAP. A mixed-methods approach (n=[number]) combined a 21-question survey and in-depth interviews to identify key factors influencing mentors' effectiveness. Findings reveal that applicants clearly understand the lobomentor role and necessary skills, prioritizing assistance, guidance, and support for incoming students. Notably, applicants aim to foster a culture of respect, integration, and inclusion, reducing school dropout behaviors. This study informs higher education institutions seeking to implement effective peer mentoring programs.</p>	
<p>Are subsections Suggestions for Improvement:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider adding a theoretical framework or conceptual model section. 2. Break up the Methodology section into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participants - Instrumentation (questionnaire design) - Data Collection - Data Analysis 3. Organize Results into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative Findings - Qualitative Findings 4. Discussion could benefit from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implications - Limitations - Future Research Directions 5. Consider adding an Appendix for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questionnaire instrument - Interview protocol <p>Recommended Structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction 2. Theoretical Framework/Conceptual Model 3. Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participants - Instrumentation - Data Collection - Data Analysis 4. Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantitative Findings - Qualitative Findings 5. Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implications - Limitations - Future Research Directions 6. Conclusion 	

Review Form 3

	7. References 8. Appendix (optional) and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	- 1. Consider citing systematic reviews or meta-analyses. 2. Balance theoretical and empirical references. 3. Ensure references align with the manuscript's focus.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Well-structured sentences.2. Appropriate use of transitional phrases.3. Clear paragraph organization. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Minor errors in verb tense consistency.2. Occasional wordiness or redundancy.3. Limited use of active voice.	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Clarity and Coherence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clearly define the research question and objectives in the introduction.2. Provide an explicit theoretical framework or conceptual model guiding the study.3. Ensure consistent terminology throughout the manuscript (e.g., "Lobomentoría" vs. "mentorship program").4. Clarify the sampling strategy and participant selection process. <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Specify the data collection methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups).2. Provide detailed information on the questionnaire design and validation.3. Explain the data analysis procedures (e.g., statistical tests, thematic analysis).4. Discuss potential biases and limitations of the study. <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Present quantitative data in clear, labelled tables and figures.2. Provide more nuance in discussing findings, exploring implications and potential explanations.3. Compare and contrast results with existing literature.4. Clarify the practical implications of the study's findings. <p>References and Citations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ensure consistency in citation style throughout the manuscript.2. Verify DOI or URL availability for all references.3. Update references to reflect the most recent publications.4. Consider including more diverse sources (e.g., international journals, books). <p>Structure and Organization</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Rearrange sections for better logical flow (e.g., move methodology before results).	

Review Form 3

	<p>2. Use clear headings and subheadings to guide the reader. 3. Ensure abstract accurately reflects manuscript content. 4. Consider adding an executive summary or summary statement.</p> <p>Language and Grammar</p> <p>1. Check for grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors. 2. Improve sentence structure and clarity. 3. Ensure consistent verb tense throughout. 4. Consider professional editing or proofreading.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>1. Figure 1: Add a legend or key to explain the chart. 2. Table 1: Clarify column headings and provide additional context. 3. Section 3.2: Expand on the Institutional Mentorship Plan (PIML) description. 4. Conclusion: Provide more nuanced implications and recommendations.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rosemary Madzore
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, Zimbabwe