

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_128275
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO LIMITED PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT IN MONITORING ACADEMIC PROGRESS OF PUPILS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY OF ILEMELA DISTRICT, MWANZA REGION.
Type of the Article	Experimental

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.	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in education—low parental engagement in monitoring pupils' academic progress, particularly in primary schools. Understanding these barriers is essential for developing effective strategies to enhance academic outcomes and close educational disparities. The study provides valuable empirical insights from a Tanzanian district, offering context-specific findings that could inform broader educational policies and practices in similar socio-economic and cultural settings. By addressing both systemic and individual-level factors, the manuscript contributes to the global discourse on improving family-school partnerships and student success.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and reflects the study's primary focus. However, it could be more concise while retaining clarity. A suggested alternative title: <i>"Factors Limiting Parental Engagement in Academic Monitoring: A Case Study from Ilmela District, Tanzania."</i>	
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 comprehensive, clearly summarizing the study's objectives, methods, findings, and recommendations. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the implications for policy or practice to strengthen its relevance. Adding a sentence on how these findings contribute to broader educational improvement might enhance its impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. The research design, methodology, and data analysis are appropriate for the study's objectives. The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods enriches the findings and aligns with best practices in educational research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, and many are recent, supporting the study's arguments effectively. However, the addition of more localized studies or global meta-analyses focusing on parental engagement could enhance the depth of the literature review. For example: Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2020) on parental involvement meta-analysis. Jeynes, W. H. (2021) on the impact of parental involvement.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor improvements in grammar, sentence structure, and word choice (e.g., avoiding redundancy) could further enhance readability. Phrasing some sections more concisely would also improve the flow of the manuscript.	
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:	Ugbede Terseer Meshach
Department, University & Country	Benue State University, Nigeria