

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_122724</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Medical Aid for Patients with Chronic Illnesses: A Case Study of Assistance to Individuals in Crisis Situation (AICS) Service in Cagayan de Oro City</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a detailed examination of the Assistance to Individuals in Crisis Situation (AICS) program, particularly focusing on its impact on beneficiaries with chronic illnesses. The research fills a gap in understanding how social welfare programs operate in crisis situations within the Philippines, offering insights that can be valuable for policy makers, healthcare providers, and social workers. However, the manuscript could benefit from enhancements to its methodology and the inclusion of more robust discussions and recommendations.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is informative and adequately reflects the content of the article. However, for greater clarity, a more focused title could be: "Evaluating the Impact of AICS on Chronic Illness Management: A Case Study in Cagayan de Oro City."	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides a good overview of the study but could be improved by briefly mentioning the research methodology and the key findings. Adding a sentence on the implications of the study's findings for policy or practice would also strengthen the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, but it lacks a discussion section, which is critical for analyzing and interpreting the results. The inclusion of a discussion section is necessary to enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor. Additionally, a clear recommendations section should be added to provide practical implications of the findings.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound in its thematic analysis of the AICS program. The use of multiple qualitative methods (In-Depth Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and Key Informant Interviews) provides a comprehensive view of the beneficiaries' experiences. However, the methodology section requires more detail, particularly in explaining participant selection and study design. The absence of a discussion section and clear recommendations also limits the manuscript's impact.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references cited in the manuscript are relevant, but a few additional recent studies on social welfare programs and healthcare provision in similar contexts could further support the research. Including more recent literature would strengthen the manuscript's foundation.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but a few minor revisions for clarity and flow would improve readability. Ensuring that technical terms are consistently defined and avoiding overly complex sentence structures will make the manuscript more accessible.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Consider including a comparative analysis with similar programs in other regions or countries to broaden the applicability of the findings. <input type="checkbox"/> Expanding the sample size and incorporating some quantitative data could provide a more comprehensive view of the AICS program's effectiveness.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Michael Mncedisi Willie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Africa</b>