

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_125727
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of TASAF beneficiaries over Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) services: A case of Kinondoni Municipality
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study has the potential to help the policymakers to improve the service delivery system in developing nations by incorporating the customers' feedback. The objective and clearly articulated problem statement help the reader to understand the issues in hand. Also, the robust qualitative technique (KIs and FGDs) is also useful to reach a meaningful outcome.	ok
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Current title looks suitable. But, I suggest the following one with minor corrections: "Perception of TASAF beneficiaries on Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) services: A Case of Kinondoni Municipality"	Noted
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.	Abstract appears to be well-written. However, I would like to add that it needs to start with problem statement, aim(s), method, findings and policy implications. The author(s) could well do-away with the first few line of the abstract.	OK
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Although the structure looks alright, the literature survey has been missing from this study. The author(s) include the reviews in the introduction. However, the paper deserves a separate section for such review.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author(s) mentioned to have used both qualitative and quantitative methods. But I have only observed findings from qualitative method. The descriptive statistics displayed by table and figure 1 can hardly qualify as quantitative method. One needs some basic regression analysis at least. Thus, I suggest not using the term "quantitative" here. Also, if possible the author needs to find out the themes from the KIs and FGDs.	Revision amended
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I feel the author(s) needs to add some latest literature or references. If there are lack of such papers, the researcher(s) can mention it in the paper.	Noted

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Looks fine. But I suggest going through it several times to correct any mistakes/errors.	
Optional/General comments	Better to code the qualitative data and come up with themes. This would make the findings robust and clear.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	