

### Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_101153
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EDUCATIONAL SUPERVISION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE: SUYE SECONDARY SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>1</b> It does not meet the minimum standards to be relevant to the scientific community. The lack of coherence between the research questions and the methodological design is evident. The conclusions do not answer the research questions. It is inconsistent research.  <b>2.</b> The research is too poor to be considered a case study. There is no description of the school. There is no description of the management function exercised. And the opinions collected are poor and without evidence.  <b>3.</b> It is not correct to say that: "The impediments to effective supervision were highlighted through a qualitative research design". Because neither the conclusions nor the results show it that way. It is not true that the conclusions say that "Head teachers and teachers who have many years of field experience should be used as supervisors" This statement has nothing to do with the empirical research carried out. The abstract is incorrect since it does not show conclusions derived from the research results, nor answers to the research questions.  <b>4.</b> The qualitative methodology should allow working the data in depth. Carry out an analysis under interpretive, reflective and critical criteria. In this case, the analysis criteria are weak and superficial. The presentation of results should correspond to the conclusions. In this case, there is no relationship either, due to the poverty of the results obtained and their lack of foundation.  <b>5.</b> In short, the research is not scientifically correct. Claims are made that do not come from the results. It is highly incoherent and inconsistent.  <b>6.</b> The references are not sufficiently recent.	The corrections has been done to make the changes on the study.I have described the school. I have made al lof the changes accordingly.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The writing and grammar are not correct. The references in the text are all badly reviewed. All this indicates little attention and carelessness.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This investigation has serious problems to be considered as such. It seems that the author has a proposal and wants to justify it: "Head teachers and teachers who have many years of field experience should be used as supervisors". But the author has not been able to design an adequate investigation for this purpose. The case study is weak, it does not describe the context of the center, nor the vulnerable educational system of Tanzania. In the methodological process, the author asks two questions to 8 participants, collects a brief response to each question from the 8 participants and with this makes a table of results that are later commented on even more briefly. With these miserable answers, it is resolved that "the head of school is not competent". And with this result, it is recommended that: "Head teachers and teachers who have many years of field experience should be used as supervisors". Incomprehensible. The reality is that with so little data there is no conclusion or possible recommendation.	The researcher asked two questions but in sub parts inside .So the information is well Depth and i have made the changes accordingly.

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