

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_128272
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING MWEDO AND TEMBO INTERVENTION PROJECTS TO MITIGATE GIRLS' DROPOUT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS WITHIN PASTORALIST COMMUNITIES: A CASE STUDY OF ARUSHA REGION, TANZANIA.
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Providing scholarships to girls students is very important to promote girls' education in developing countries like Tanzania. The study "Evaluating MWEDO and TEMBO intervention projects to mitigate girls' dropout in secondary schools within pastoralist communities. It has focused on the support to marginalized populations for poor girl's education, it is valuable for both girls' rights in education and national development. Finally, support for girls to continue their education will be helpful to stop high dropout rates.	
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 methodology fails to show the relationship between the support program and the educational outcome of students. It only discussed the status of the support program. It also failed to provide empirical evidence on the successes and challenges of these interventions and offered recommendations for policy and practice. The researcher has not presented any figures, or bar graphs to present the data	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The researcher tries to show the value of intervention projects for girl's education but does have not a clear picture of the progress of the academic outcome of the student. Therefore, this study fails to fulfill scientific academic outcomes on the issue.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used in this study are sufficient but can increase with the current year's issue.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article needs to improve for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Thuma Kumari Paudel
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal