

Paper: “**Higher Education Funding Strategies: Towards Equity, Efficiency, and Quality**”

Submitted: 05 April 2022

Accepted: 02 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Tinatin Gabrichidze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n19p20](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n19p20)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mary Afi Mensah
University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: April 22, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: May 9, 2022
Manuscript Title: Funding Strategies in Higher Education – Steering Towards Equity, Efficiency and Quality	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Suggested Title Higher Education Funding Strategies: Towards Equity, Efficiency and Quality	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
ABSTRACT (Suggested/Revised Abstract)	

<p>As economists have become increasingly interested in higher education, economic reasoning has been applied, resulting in extremely useful research in the field of higher education. With the growth of market forces in higher education, the changing role of government and advances in research on the economics of higher education, higher education funding is increasingly seen as a tool to stimulate the market. The development of an effective funding strategy may be one of the keys to the development of higher education - its quality and efficiency, increasing equity, and equality. The article adds to the existing literature on higher education funding and the impact of market forces on higher education. It aims to provide an analysis of economic reasoning applied to higher education, which can be used as a tool to develop a funding strategy. It also includes an overview of different funding models in relation to economic reasoning, and provides a synthesis of different funding strategies in terms of their impact on the higher education market.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Few grammatical Errors were detected as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Inappropriate expression and a spelling mistake - Shortly sspeaking i. 'interest' was wrongly spelt as 'interst' i. 'prestige' was wrongly spelt as 'prestigue' v. Use of wrong word 'weigh' instead of 'weight' v. Wrong expression - The market cannot discipline price... i. Wrong expression - The same discussions can be applied to the consumers, as 'students' behavior is also sometimes... should read ... 'student behavior'... i. The author should consider sticking to the acronym 'HE' for 'higher education' instead of mixing the two throughout the text. <p>Please, refer to the paper/manuscript for details.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>No study method was presented in the manuscript</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Satisfactory</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Good</p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>3</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. I do not see an end of text reference list. i. The following in-text citations do not conform to any reference style: (Jooste, 2020) (Jongbloed B. , 2020b). (Mendiolla, 2012) (Dill, et al., 2004) (Guri-Rosenblit, et al., 2007). (Panigrahi, 2018) (Callender, 2020) (Johnstone B. D., 2004) (Johnstone B. , 2020) 	

(OECD, 2017) (OECD, 2020)
 (Johnstone B. , 2002) (Teixera & Landoni, 2017).
 (Jongbloed B. , 2010) (Sporn, 2020)
 (Mikesell, 2011) (Toutkoushian & Paulsen, 2016).
 (Jongbloed B. , 2010) (Herbst, 2020)
 ‘p. 62’ instead of ‘p.62’. All page numbers of quoted texts should be rewritten. For example, (p.32), (p.15), (EUA, 2015 p.11), etc.

Please, refer to the paper/manuscript for details.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- i. The manuscript does not have page numbers; these must be provided.
- ii. End of the text references list must be generated for the manuscript.
- iii. In-text citations must be edited to conform to a referencing style. For example, APA, Chicago, etc.
- iv. It should be indicated whether the diagram is the author's creation, adopted or adapted.
- v. Too many complex sentences. The author should consider using a combination of simple, compound and complex sentences.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: