

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_110829
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Educational Facilities and Administrative Effectiveness in Colleges of Education
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? The manuscript's implication for the scientific community is not clearly stated, and its importance is not thoroughly emphasized. While the introduction provides a broad context of the significance of education and management in colleges, the manuscript lacks a clear articulation of its specific contribution to existing scholarship. The introductory section introduces various factors influencing education, management, and facilities without explicitly outlining the novel aspects or gaps addressed by the study.</p> <p>To enhance the manuscript's importance for the scientific community, it is recommended to explicitly state the research gap or problem the study seeks to address. Additionally, highlighting the potential implications of the findings for educational policy, institutional management, or future research could further underscore the manuscript's significance. The introduction should explicitly outline the unique contributions of the study and how it advances existing knowledge in the field.</p> <p>Moreover, the manuscript would benefit from deeper analysis and discussion of the data. The current content tends to describe issues and findings without delving into a comprehensive exploration or critical interpretation. Providing a more profound analysis of the data and connecting it explicitly to the research questions and hypotheses would strengthen the scholarly depth of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? The title, "Assessment of Educational Facilities and Administrative Effectiveness in Colleges of Education," effectively encapsulates the main theme of the research. It succinctly communicates the focus on evaluating the impact of educational facilities on administrative effectiveness in a specific context. No significant revision is required; however, for added specificity, considering the inclusion of "A Case Study in Delta State" might enhance clarity about the study's geographical scope.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract provides a solid overview of the research, covering the research aims, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. It successfully communicates the essential components of the study, making it comprehensive. For further improvement, consider providing more specific numerical results in the abstract, such as significant coefficients or differences observed. Additionally, clarity on the nature of the educational facilities assessed could enhance the reader's understanding.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The writing of sections and subsections in the manuscript is not appropriate. I recommend referring to the journal's writing guidelines or examining examples from previous articles in the same journal for guidance.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, in quantitative research, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6 . Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Some references, like Afolabi (2002) and Ekaette (2001), are relatively dated. While these foundational works may have historical significance, consider incorporating more recent studies to provide a comprehensive overview of current trends and perspectives.</p> <p>7. While the findings provide a basic overview of the status of educational facilities in Delta State</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Ok</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>8. Colleges of Education, the discussion lacks depth and critical analysis. It would be beneficial to delve into the nuances and complexities surrounding the discrepancies between the current study's findings and those of previous research. Consider exploring potential reasons for the variations observed and discussing the broader implications of these disparities on the educational landscape in Delta State. Additionally, incorporating theoretical frameworks or educational models could add depth to the discussion and enhance the scholarly quality of the manuscript. Overall, a more comprehensive and analytical approach to the discussion is recommended.</p> <p>9. The conclusion section is relatively brief and lacks depth, mirroring the simplicity observed in the discussion. To enhance the scholarly rigor of the conclusion, consider delving into a more nuanced analysis of the implications of the findings. For instance, explore the broader significance of the observed relationships between educational facilities and administrative effectiveness. Additionally, provide context for the recommendations by discussing the potential challenges in implementing them and the anticipated impact on the overall educational landscape. This will contribute to a more comprehensive and academically robust conclusion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		Ok
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The linguistic quality of the article is rather simplistic; it would be advisable to elevate the language to a more sophisticated level, better aligned with the standards expected in scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The study provides a comprehensive overview of the impact of educational facilities on administrative effectiveness within Colleges of Education. However, the discussion section lacks the depth needed for a thorough analysis of the data. It is recommended to go beyond a mere comparison with previous studies and delve into a more nuanced interpretation of the findings. A more profound exploration of the implications of the observed relationships between educational facilities and administrative effectiveness would enhance the scholarly contribution of the research. Additionally, considering potential limitations and addressing how these findings could be applied in practical educational settings would enrich the overall discussion.	

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