

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_87655
Title of the Manuscript:	PANGAYAW: SEEKING PEACE IN VENGEANCE AMONG BLAAN TRIBE IN KIBLAWAN, DAVAO DEL SUR
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	TITLE: Suggested title change: "BLAAN TRIBE COMPETING STRATEGIES IN THEIR PRACTICE OF PANGAYAW". INTRODUCTION: The introduction is well-founded, bringing important concepts and data to affirm the hypothesis proposed by the researchers, but I felt the need to justify the importance of the study in the scientific and professional scope, as it will impact the scientific community. METHODOLOGY: Research Project: The authors quote Creswell (2013) about what qualitative research is, but the concept is more focused on explored research than it relates to a little explored study. Review the citation. Data analysis: The word "researcher" came up twice. Please correct. Review at the end of the paragraph, in which the author refers in the first person. Ethical considerations: Did the author forward the Free and Informed Consent Form to the participants? Specify in this item. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: Who was the instrument used for data collection validated? Why judges? Did the authors create? Did you use another author? If yes, you must specify whether your authorization was requested. In the body of the text, the authors identified the name of the participants by alphabetical letters. It is necessary to specify this in the study method, as the basis of the ethical criteria of the study. CONCLUSION: I suggest that the author review the way he described the results by mentioning in the first person and bringing personal values. I suggest reviewing the journal's guidelines to see if it is accepted that way. I missed bringing the main limitations of the study, suggestions for further research as well.	All the necessary corrections were done
Minor REVISION comments	DISCUSSION: I suggest that you join the categories according to the results and discussion, or avoid repeating the discussion categories so as not to be repetitive for the reader. I suggest looking at the journal's rules if that's allowed.	Revised
Optional/General comments	ABSTRACT: The abstract provided relevant information on how the study was developed. KEYWORDS: they are subject to the title and objective of the study REFERENCES: Updated references.	Revised

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) This study was conducted. with strict adherence to the ethical protocols and guidelines set by the University of Mindanao Ethics Committee. The researcher made sure to follow this through requesting and securing from key authorities the permission needed to complete this research, from the conduct until the manuscript is completed and the storing of data."	