

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_128281
Title of the Manuscript:	The Poor Performance of Students with Hearing Impairments in Tanzania: A Case Study of Iringa Girls' Secondary School
Type of the Article	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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses critical gaps in understanding the barriers faced by students with hearing impairments in inclusive educational settings, particularly in the context of Tanzania. By providing empirical evidence on systemic challenges such as the shortage of specialized teachers, inadequate resources, and limited institutional support, the study contributes to the global discourse on inclusive education. It also offers practical recommendations for enhancing academic outcomes, which can inform policy development and implementation in similar settings worldwide. Furthermore, the findings highlight the importance of tailoring educational strategies to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities, promoting equity and inclusivity in education systems.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "The Poor Performance of Students with Hearing Impairments in Tanzania: A Case Study of Iringa Girls' Secondary School," is somewhat suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. However, it could be made more engaging and focused by emphasizing the broader context and solutions explored in the manuscript. Suggested Alternative Title: "Barriers to Academic Success for Students with Hearing Impairments in Tanzania: Insights from Iringa Girls' Secondary School" This revised title maintains the core focus while making it more appealing and highlighting the study's contribution to understanding the barriers to education for students with hearing impairments.</p>	
<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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study, including the context, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. However, it could be improved with the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include one or two specific statistics or key findings from the study to make the abstract more informative. 2. Eliminate redundant phrases like "supporting inclusive education and improving academic performance" to make it more concise. 3. Highlight the broader implications of the findings, such as how they can inform policy or practice in inclusive education. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>No. There are several scientific inconsistencies and questionable references that undermine its credibility:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Several references cited in the manuscript appear to be fabricated or unverifiable, which raises concerns about the scientific integrity of the work. 2. While the study claims to employ mixed methods, there is insufficient evidence of quantitative analysis in the results, which contradicts the methodology stated. 3. The attribution of data, such as "Field Data (2024)," lacks clarity and may be misleading. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On Page 2, Line 12, please use "et al." instead of listing all the authors' names e.g., "Smith et al. (2021)." 2. On Page 4, Line 7, the citation "(URT, 2017)" is abbreviated, but in the reference list (Reference 21), it is written in full. Please ensure consistency by either abbreviating or writing it in full in both the text and reference list. 3. Page 7: In Table 1, the source is attributed to "Field Data (2024)," which is not feasible as the data pertains to the period 2017–2023. The authors should please clarify the source of this data and ensure accurate attribution, reflecting when and how the data was collected. 4. Page 24: Reference number 1 cites Braun and Clarke (2019) with the DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_103, but the identified work appears to be dated 2012 according to Google Scholar. The authors should please verify the publication year and ensure accurate citation details. 5. Page 24: In reference number 2, the page numbers listed (1643-1647) do not match those found in Google Scholar (37-43) for the same work. The authors should please verify and correct the page numbers to ensure accuracy. 6. Page 24: In reference number 3, the publication year is listed as 2018, but Google Scholar cites it as 2017. The authors should please verify and update the reference to ensure the correct publication year is reflected. 7. Page 25: In reference number 4, only the journal name (<i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i>) and volume number (62) should be italicized, as per the APA referencing style. 8. Page 25: Reference number 6 appears to be fabricated, as it does not exist in Google Scholar or any credible source. The authors should please verify its authenticity and replace it with a valid reference. 9. Page 25: Reference number 7 appears to be fabricated, as it cannot be found in Google Scholar or any credible source. The authors should please verify its authenticity and replace it with a valid reference. Ensure all references are legitimate and accurately cited. 10. Page 25: Reference number 8 lists incorrect details. According to Google Scholar, the correct citation is "Krueger, R. A. (2014). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Sage Publications." The authors should please verify and update the reference accordingly. 11. Page 25: Reference number 9 lists the publication year as 2018, but Google Scholar cites it as 2008. The authors should please verify the correct publication year and update the reference to ensure accuracy. 12. Page 25: Reference number 10 lists the publication year as 2005, but Google Scholar cites it as 2023. The authors should please verify the correct publication year and update the reference accordingly to ensure accuracy. 13. Page 25: Reference number 11 appears to be fabricated, as it cannot be found in Google Scholar or any other credible source. The authors should please verify its authenticity and replace it with a valid reference. 14. Page 25: Reference number 12 appears to be fabricated, as it cannot be found in Google Scholar or any other credible source. The authors should please verify its authenticity and replace it with a valid reference. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>15. Page 26: Reference number 13 appears to be fabricated, as it cannot be found in Google Scholar or any other credible source. The authors should please verify its authenticity and replace it with a valid reference.</p> <p>16. Page 26: Reference number 16 appears to be fabricated, as it cannot be found in Google Scholar or any other credible source. The authors should please verify its authenticity and replace it with a valid reference.</p> <p>17. Page 26: Reference number 17 appears to be fabricated, as the DOI provided corresponds to a completely different study in Google Scholar. The authors should please verify and replace it with a legitimate and accurate reference.</p> <p>18. Page 26: Reference number 21 lacks a verification link or additional details for locating the source. The authors should please provide a URL, DOI, or other verifiable information to ensure readers can access and validate this reference.</p> <p>19. Page 26-27: In the reference list, entries 17 and 24, as well as 19 and 20, are duplicates. The authors should please remove the repeated references to ensure the list is accurate and concise.</p> <p>20. Page 25-27: References 5, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, and 22 are not cited in the manuscript. The authors should please ensure all listed references are cited in the text or remove them from the reference list to maintain consistency and relevance.</p> <p>21. Page 27: Reference number 23 lacks a verification link, and it is unclear how both WHO and World Bank are listed as authors. The authors should please clarify the citation format and include a valid URL or DOI for proper verification.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript contains grammatical mistakes and awkward phrasing, such as "supporting inclusive education and improving academic performance required initiatives." 2. Terms like "hearing learning devices" and "assistive devices" are used interchangeably without clear definitions, which can confuse readers. 3. Repetition of ideas, particularly in the aims and discussion sections, affects the clarity and flow of the text. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 1, Line 11: Phrases like "supporting inclusive education" and "improving academic performance" lack alignment with specific actions discussed later. The authors should consider providing measurable strategies or specific recommendations (e.g., "increased teacher training by X%"). 2. Page 1, Lines 1-2: The authors should please provide a citation to support the opening statement in the introduction. The authors should consider referencing a credible source that discusses the unique challenges faced by students with hearing impairments in educational settings. 3. Page 1, Line 21; Page 2, Lines 18-20, and Lines 24-26: The aim of the study is stated multiple times in the introduction section. To improve clarity and coherence, consolidate the aim into a single, concise statement placed at the end of the introduction section. 4. The introduction references prior studies but lacks recent examples that highlight global advancements in inclusive education. For example, cite innovative technologies in education or successful policies from other countries for comparative context. 5. On Page 4, Lines 10-14, the conclusion of the study is stated too early in the paper. The authors should consider reframing or moving this summary to the discussion or conclusion section to maintain the logical flow and avoid revealing the study's findings prematurely. 6. On Page 4, Line 20, the authors state that "qualitative and quantitative methods" were employed; however, the manuscript does not present clear evidence of quantitative data collection, analysis, or results. The authors should please clarify the quantitative aspects of the study or revise the methodology description to reflect a predominantly qualitative approach. 7. On Page 8, Line 15, replace "The figure 1 below" with "Figure 1" to adhere to proper academic writing conventions, as figures should not be referred to as "above" or "below." 8. While appropriate, the rationale for selecting 23 participants is insufficient. Expand on why this number was adequate for the study's scope. Could saturation have been achieved with fewer or more participants? 9. Specific documents reviewed (e.g., "inclusive education policies") are mentioned, but their selection criteria remain vague. The authors should clarify how these documents were chosen and their relevance. 10. Data in Table 1 spans 2017–2023 but lacks comparisons to other schools or regions. Including these could contextualize the performance trends and indicate whether the observed challenges are specific to Iringa Girls' Secondary School or systemic. 11. Much of the discussion reiterates results without deeper interpretation. For instance, instead of restating "limited sign language skills among teachers," analyze how this gap impacts cognitive development or class engagement for students. 12. The discussion calls for "targeted strategies" but does not outline actionable steps. Incorporate specific policy recommendations, such as introducing mandatory teacher certifications in sign language. 13. The conclusion repeats the findings without addressing broader implications. Strengthen by summarizing potential impacts on policy, practice, and future research. 14. The urgency of addressing barriers is clear, but the manuscript could benefit from a direct call to action, specifying roles for policymakers, educators, and community stakeholders. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Ochuko Felix Orikpete
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria