

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_130524
Title of the Manuscript:	Systematic review on public relations strategies in Ghanaian Universities.
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>

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 is significant for advancing the understanding of public relations (PR) strategies in higher education institutions, particularly within the Ghanaian context. It addresses a critical gap by exploring the role of PR in managing institutional reputation, fostering alumni relations, enhancing enrollment, and securing funding. The study contributes to the growing body of literature on PR as a strategic tool for higher education management and provides actionable insights for university administrators.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is appropriate and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, you may consider refining it slightly to emphasize the study's broader implications, such as: “A Systematic Review of Public Relations Strategies in Ghanaian Universities: Implications for Higher Education Management.”	
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 informative but could be more concise. It includes valuable background information but lacks a clear summary of the methodology and key findings. Consider rephrasing to highlight the main strategies identified, challenges discussed, and recommendations provided.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, and the systematic review methodology is robust. However, it would benefit from additional critical analysis, synthesizing patterns across the reviewed studies instead of merely summarizing individual findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally relevant and sufficient. However, including more recent studies on digital PR tools and crisis communication in higher education post-2020 would strengthen the manuscript. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Articles on AI-driven PR strategies.Studies addressing post-pandemic PR challenges in universities.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication but contains minor redundancies, particularly in the introduction and literature review sections. Streamlining the content for clarity and conciseness is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Including a summary table categorizing the studies reviewed (e.g., based on PR strategy type, methodology, key findings) would enhance readability.Discussing future research directions, such as evaluating the effectiveness of PR strategies through measurable outcomes, would add value.Provide more emphasis on practical recommendations for Ghanaian universities.	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. Suresh Kumar
Department, University & Country	St. Joseph University, India