

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130692
Title of the Manuscript:	Programme Analytical Framework for Human Development Programmes
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.	This manuscript offers significant contributions to the scientific community by addressing the gap in the systematic analysis of data in human development programmes. It presents a structured Programme Analytical Framework (PAF) that can be widely adopted to optimize data use for decision-making, ultimately enhancing programme quality and impact. The emphasis on organizational culture change, capacity building, and the development of practical tools for analysis provides a comprehensive approach to improving the effectiveness of data-driven decision-making. Furthermore, the integration of real-world examples and application across sectors strengthens its relevance and applicability for both researchers and practitioners in the field of human development	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Programme Analytical Framework for Human Development Programmes" is clear and adequately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, it could be made more specific to highlight the key aspects discussed. A suggested alternative title could be: "Enhancing Data Utilization in Human Development Programmes: A Structured Programme Analytical Framework for Improved Decision-Making and Outcomes"	
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 is comprehensive but could benefit from a clearer focus on the expected outcomes of implementing the Programme Analytical Framework, such as improved decision-making and programme effectiveness. Additionally, streamlining the mention of Theory of Change to directly relate to the framework's impact would make it more concise and targeted.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. It presents a coherent framework for improving the analysis of programme data in human development programmes, backed by relevant theories and evidence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient but could benefit from including more recent sources, particularly those from the last 3–5 years, to reflect the latest trends in programme analysis and data utilization frameworks.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some sentences could be streamlined for clarity and flow. Minor edits for conciseness and readability would enhance its impact.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents a comprehensive framework for improving program analysis in human development initiatives. However, refining some sections for clarity and ensuring consistency in terminology would enhance its readability and overall impact.	

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:	Chandra Shekhar
Department, University & Country	IGNOU, India