

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126391
Title of the Manuscript:	University-Community Engagement on Consulting Services for Sustainable Development: Insights from the Open University of Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I would like to give credit to the author(s) for choosing such a nice topic which is concerned with community engagement and sustainable development. I liked this manuscript because it focuses on the social responsibility of universities and their immediate and long-term impacts. This manuscript is going to inspire the scientific community to develop a more rigorous model in this area and have a broader impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title given by the author: University-Community Engagement on Consulting Services for Sustainable Development: Insights from the Open University of Tanzania</p> <p>Suggested Alternative title: University-Community Engagement in Consulting Services and Their Perceived Impact on Sustainable Development: Insights from the Open University of Tanzania</p> <p>The study was conducted on the staff of the Open University of Tanzania who were not the beneficiaries of the services, and they explained the perceived impact of their community engagement in consulting services on sustainable development without any facts or statistics. If the data were collected from those who have taken community services and explained the sustainability impacts, they received, in my opinion then the author's chosen topic would have reflected what s/he has shown.</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.	I would suggest the author(s) briefly clarify sustainable development in the abstract, everywhere the author(s) addresses sustainable development but nowhere does it mention the criteria of sustainable development that is going to be achieved. Also in the KEYWORDS: Author(s) skipped Sustainable Development. I think it should be added in the KEYWORDS.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>I think the author(s) needs to rearrange the structure of this manuscript as follows:</p> <p>1.0 Introduction (at one point the research gap should be clearly identified and the research objectives should be clearly expressed so that those can be discussed in the discussion section comparing with present and previous results)</p> <p>2.0 Literature Review, (I should include a Theory as the base of this paper and clarify the main variables in light of previous studies)</p> <p>3.0 Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Research Design, 3.2 Population and Sample, 3.3 Sampling and Data Collection, 3.4 Data Analysis Tools and Techniques, 3.5 Ethical Considerations <p>4.0 Results</p> <p>The author(s) should include the demographic profile of the respondents, with their age, experience, designation, educational qualifications,</p> <p>All the subsections are okay but the author(s) should present the statistical data with a Pie chart/ Bar Chart or any other diagram for visual representation.</p> <p>5.0 Discussion</p> <p>Compare the present results with findings from previous research in the light of research objectives.</p> <p>6.0 Implications (Theoretical and Managerial)</p> <p>7.0 Limitations and Future Research Agenda</p> <p>8.0 Conclusions</p> <p>References</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound since it has followed a scientific structure. Yet it needs improvement. As the author(s) tried to measure the impacts of University-Community Engagement in Consulting Services on Sustainable Development, the author(s) should have collected data for University-Community Engagement in Consulting from the University staff and Sustainable Development data from the outcome statistics of community development services. So, I would suggest the author(s) change the TOPIC as suggested.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references used are mostly very outdated. I would suggest adding some more latest references to reflect the recent developments in the perspective.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>For me, the language looks mostly okay. Still, there are a few sentence structure and grammatical mistakes please go through the manuscript and try to have a proofread by an expert.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Md. Hafizur Rahman</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bangladesh Army University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh</p>