

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_128279
Title of the Manuscript:	MANAGERIAL STRATEGIES FOR ALLEVIATING OCCUPATIONAL STRESS TO ENHANCE JOB PERFORMANCE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MWANZA REGION, TANZANIA
Type of the Article	Empirical Research 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.	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in education—occupational stress among secondary school teachers—and its impact on job performance. The study offers valuable insights into managerial strategies that can enhance teacher well-being and educational outcomes. The mixed-methods approach ensures robust and comprehensive findings, making it a significant contribution to the field of education management and policy formulation. This research is particularly relevant for policymakers aiming to improve teaching environments in developing regions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It effectively conveys the focus on managerial strategies, occupational stress, and job performance. No changes are necessary.	
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-structured and provides an overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and implications. However, adding details on the specific managerial interventions identified (e.g., recognition, delegation, etc.) would improve clarity.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust. The methodology, including the use of Cronbach's alpha for reliability testing and mixed-methods design, is appropriate for the research objectives. The integration of the Job Demand-Control Model strengthens the study's theoretical foundation. The explanation of sampling procedures is detailed but lacks justification for certain choices (e.g., why 15% of teachers were sampled but 78% of school heads). This could create confusion regarding proportionality. The statistical terms (mean, standard deviation, and kurtosis) are not explained. Readers unfamiliar with these terms may find this section less accessible.	
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 include recent studies, such as those published in 2023 and 2024. However, the authors may consider incorporating additional global perspectives to enhance the manuscript's generalizability. However some references are incomplete or lack uniform formatting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Example: "Maslach and Leiter (2022)" lacks full citation in the references section. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical corrections (e.g., spacing and punctuation issues) are recommended for improved readability. <p>Identified Mistakes (Examples Provided)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammatical and Typographical Errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Incorrect word usage (<i>drawnsignificant</i> → <i>drawn significant</i>). ○ Missing space (<i>highlightedthe</i> → <i>highlighted the</i>). ○ Incorrect verb form (<i>countenanced a comprehensive</i> → <i>countenancing a comprehensive</i>). ○ Missing spaces after punctuation (<i>found that,employees</i> → <i>found that, employees</i>). 2. Redundancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Repetition of ideas (<i>The teaching workforce in Mwanza was predominantly composed of individuals with higher education qualifications</i> → Already stated in the preceding sentences). 3. Incomplete or Unclear Sentences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long and unclear sentence (<i>Understanding and addressing the factors contributing to teacher stress is paramount...specifically among secondary school teachers in Mwanza region</i> → Needs to be split for clarity). 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from additional graphical representation of the findings, such as bar charts or pie charts for demographic data. This would enhance the reader's understanding of key insights. Demographic insights (e.g., age, gender, experience) and results could be enhanced with visual elements like charts or graphs to improve data presentation and engagement.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Nikita Mukherjee</u>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<u>Birla Institute of Technology Mesra, India</u>