

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129432
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation of Study Assignment Policy For State Civil Apparatus In Gorontalo Provincial Government
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.	The manuscript's relevance in the scientific community is based on the outcome of the qualitative research adopted, in the process of transforming the civil service in Gorontalo Provincial government. This method led to identifying the challenges, compliance level and obstacles to achieving an efficient civil service. Conclusions were drawn based on the analysis and lessons were learnt.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is okay	
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 should have begun with the background of a problem before the objective. The first 2 lines in the introduction section ' <i>the problem is the low quality of civil servants—</i> ' may serve as a good problem statement slightly modified. Furthermore, the abstract should end with a recommendation which seems to be lacking in the manuscript.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	I believe the manuscript is scientifically correct because the research findings align with the facts (field observations and interviews).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I believe the references are sufficient because the focus is on the transformation of Gorontalo Provincial Government and probably similar governments in the country not necessarily a review of diverse agencies and parastatals.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality is clear and suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	There was little or no mention of any sister agencies or governments if and how they implement study Assignment Policy for civil servants. Recommendations should be made after conclusion. This could further enrich the manuscript.	

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:	Uchechi Chinazom Ekejiuba
Department, University & Country	Nile University of Nigeria, Nigeria