

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

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>
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.	This study throws light on the peer mentoring practice and its effectiveness in Mexican university, which was responsible in bringing down the student dropout rate from 8.8 in 2020-21 to 6% in 2022-23. It highlights the critical mentor characteristics, collected from respondents. This study is relevant for the universities that look for implementing a peer-mentoring program to tackle student issues. Though this study uses mixed methods, use of an effective analytical tool would have highlighted the key outcomes of the objective.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract is well written, which includes introduction to study, objectives, research methodology and the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript introduces the chosen topic, its relevance and theoretical framework of study. But, study objective and research design needs to be more clear. The questionnaire is not tested for reliability. The sample size for the study is not mentioned. Scope of the study may also be included.	
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.	The manuscript is not clear on the objective and no hypothesis is set. The research design, sample size, sampling method, and analytical tool used is nowhere mentioned in the article. The technical quality of the manuscript needs attention. A correlation study between mentors' previous experience in social and community participation and mentee expectations can be included to give outcomes that are more meaningful.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript can be accepted with minor correction as indicated above.	

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:	Sharadha S
Department, University & Country	Surana College (Autonomous), India