

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_82261
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN PUBLIC DAY SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>✓ TITLE: Based on the fifth line of the abstract ,the title should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Effects of stakeholder involvement on implementation of physical infrastructure projects in secondary schools: a case of West Pokot and Trans Nzoia Counties, Kenya. <p>✓ ABSTRACT After the 10th line onward the abstract needs major revision in the following five issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ First, it was mentioned that the study used both questionair and interview guide to collect data (see line 10). However, there is no data collected using interview guide in this manuscript. Thus, the authos (s) aould clear the confusion ✓ Second, it was mentioned on line 10 and 11 that “The validity and reliability test of the tools was (should be were) done based on consultation of experts” . Since, the author (s) did not show the results showing these tests, no need for the above statement and should be deleted (see comments for further clarification) ✓ Third, it was mentioned in line 13 and 14, that “Qualitative data collected ws organized and analyzed”. But there is no result showing qualitative data and analysis in this manuscript and should be deleted. If at all if qualitative data analysed, the result should be discussed briefly. ✓ Forth, the only result or finding in this manuscript mentioned was “The finding indicates that in both Counties, stakeholders were involved in School infrustructure development project at varied levels”. First of all mentioning only one result does not provide complete picture on the title of the manuscript. Second, the Title says ...stakeholders involvement on the implementation of physical infrustructure ... but the finding is about stakeholders involvement on infrustructure development project. Involvement in project development implies their participation in the project design stage prior to embarking into implmentation. Therefor, this result does not have relation with the title. ✓ Finally, there is no any feasible recommendation in the abstract section <p>✓ INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After this marvelout and informative introduction, the researcher was required mention clearly two things: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What are (at lease two) the research questions the study need to address or specific objectives the study intends to examine so as to identify clearly the EFFECTS OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KENYA” 2) The gap(s) this study will fill to judge the significance of the study <p>✓ IN LITERATUREREVIEW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author should not assume readers understood everything written in the manuscript. Threfore, the following words or phrases need operational definition – involvement, Public day <p>✓ METHODOLOGY: I suggest the author to include or consider the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sample size determination formula given by Yamane (1967) is $n = \frac{N}{(1 + Ne^2)}$ <p>Where, N = is the total population, n is the required sample size, e is the margin of error.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thus, the above and the margin of error used in the study to draw 218 samples out of 479 i (whether e=0.05 or higher or lower)should be mentioned and plug in the formula . • Moreover, in the methodology part this statement that tells how 146 samples were 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>allocated should be written again. Wether the 146 samples were shared by the seven Sub Countries in the two counties shared equly or proportionally not mentioned..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the methodology part, it is mentioned that "...upon getting university authority to collect data" However, till this section nothing has been mention about a university. Thus, you need to mention the name of the university that authorized the data collection. Moreover, please also add after getting as "--- getting permission from NAME university to collect data• Though the researcher mentioned in the abstract section that an interview guide was also used as data collection instrument, nothing has been mentioned in the Methodology part. Be consistent <p>✓ RECOMMENDATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The recommendations are not in line with the findings of the study. Particularly, reconsider youe conclusion on "..., now PTA is zero rated " <p>I checked plagiarism Using paper press. Net online and only 12% of the manuscript is similar to other studies, Though there here is a lack of consensus or clear-cut-rules on what percentage of plagiarism is acceptable in a manuscript, by the convention, usually a text similarity below 15% is acceptable by the journals and a similarity of >25% is considered as high percentage of plagiarism.</p> <p>(See The output of Paper press. Net that checked for plagiarism and sent with thi form)</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Improve the editorial errors ✓ The title of the manuscript: It should indicate where the study was conducted. As mentioned in the abstract (in the 5th and 6th lines) it is clear that the study was conducted in Kenya using West Pokot and Trans Nzoia Counties as case studies. Add this also in the title (see comment on the manuscript) ✓ ABSTRACT: The statement that mentions about validity and reliability; interview guides, and qualitative data analysis should be deleted ✓ METHODOLOGY: Reconsider the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this study nothing has been mentioned about a university. Thus, you need to mention which university authorized the data collection • There is no secondary data used in this study. Therefore, please delete the statement from the long paragraph on page 7 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ On the basis of my long years experience in research and article review, I would like to provide the comment what should an article include: ✓ Abstract must cover the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Problem Statement: This section should include answers of the questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why was research needed?. ○ What was the context of the work?. ○ Introduce the problem or provide background for what you will address. ✓ Introduction: should be covered briefly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Research background (Importance/need/rationale) ➢ Problem statement (Gap analysis (difference between present and desired performance)) ➢ Research objectives (Specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, Time-based) ➢ Research scope (Area should be covered) ➢ Approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research methodology (Steps to achieve objectives) ○ Data collection (Why this data, method) ○ What did you do and how did you go about solving or making progress on the problem. ○ Describe the method of research, study, or analysis applied to the problem. ➢ Findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Analysis (Information generated toward analysis) ○ What results did you get? ○ Results and discussions (Drawing conclusions on the specific objectives) or state what you found and relate it to the problem. ○ Summarize the major results in numbers, avoid vague, hand waving results such as “very small” or “significant”. ➢ Conclusions/Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the implications of your answer? ○ State the relevance, implications, or significance of the results or conclusions, to the business. ○ Significance of work is often implied by the recommendations or implications for future work. 	<p style="text-align: center;">▪</p>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<p><i>.(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>There is no asuch unethical issues in this manuscript. On the methodology section, the author mentioned that data collection was conducted after obtaining clearance from a university (though the name of the university is not mentioned). It would be better to mention if the concents of respondents were secured prior to data collection or not</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wondaferahu Mulugeta Demissie
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Civil Service University, Ethiopia