

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_89467
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN THE DELIVERY OF EDUCATION AT THE BASIC SCHOOL LEVEL
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper approaches a significant topic. The structure of the paper is clearly presented and argued. Each paragraph contains the specific elements, presented in a clear and cursive way. The conclusions are relevant and specific. The bibliographic resources are in appropriate number and relevant for the research performed.	
Minor REVISION comments	Is recommended: Use a unitary style of bibliographic references in the text, according to the instructions for authors (use "et al." in the case of 3 or more authors in unitary style). Include the following authors (mentioned in the text) in the bibliographic list: House (1995) – p.1 Shaeffer (1992) – p.3 Umura (1999) – p.3 More attention to phrasing, there are few inappropriate formulations (eg. p. 3 paramouncy = correct paramouncy; appears to remains = correct appears to remain; a phenomenon tha = correct a phenomenon that).	
Optional/General comments	Very interesting topic. It is an adequately documented paper, with a well-defined research design and conclusions relevant to educational management. The recommended (minor) changes concern the form and not the content of the paper.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Irina-Teodora Manolescu
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania