



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_41051
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sociocultral Factors on Academic Performance among Candidates in Kisumu City, Kenya
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>The manuscript is of potential interest to the readership of this journal, but there are major issues that must be addressed before the article could be published.</p> <p>1/ * The literature review should be more carefully synthesised and structured. The use of sub-headings and signposting would help the reader to follow the argument being developed through this section.</p> <p>2/ * There does not appear to be an explicit theoretical framework - this makes it difficult to explain the differences between outcomes of the research groups. Currently the manuscript appears to be somewhat descriptive and a theoretical.</p> <p>3/ * The results section requires far greater organisation and structuring. The analysis is too general and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed.</p> <p>4/ * Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive.</p> <p>5/ * The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge.</p> <p>6/* More recent bibliography is necessary. Furthermore, the reference list is a little bit weak.</p> <p>7/* The academic writing needs work.</p> <p>8/* In preparing a revised manuscript, please also include a table of how you have responded to each of the issues listed above point by point.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript in the near future.</p>	<p>Sub-headings and signposting used in the Literature Review, which are 3.2. 1 collectivist culture, 3.2.2 political activism and 3.2.3 witchcraft and spiritism. Ref Literature Review section</p> <p>Theoretical framework provided in section 3.1, which is Bandura's (1989) Triadic Reciprocal Determinism</p> <p>The Reviewer might have been more specific on comment 3. The author does not understand the meaning of "far greater", "too general" and "somewhat". The author believes interpretation has been done to yield the three aspects of socioculture that affects students' performance.</p> <p>Contribution to new knowledge in conclusion has been captured</p> <p>Reference list has been increased</p> <p>Author begs indulgence of reviewer to be more specific on "more work"</p> <p>Point 8 obliged</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		