

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_89848
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ASSESSMENT OF THE RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE OF THIRD YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF THE THREE DIOCESES IN NEGROS OCCIDENTAL: A BASIS FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PROGRAM
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	The manuscript is original and has novelty in the field appropriate to the area of research The key words are Okey Recast the problem statement, it is not only be the aim the research nor the research questions, but what prompted the researcher to conduct the research The methodology is suitable to the context of the research; however, Reliability of the instrument (PASKO) was not stated in the methodology, and statistical tool not mentioned, it seems that the researcher used simple percentage and variance. The analysis of the results is sufficient and appropriate. The results and discussion are well articulated; However, current references need to be added to support or oppose the results The conclusion is relevant to the data and results, there was not bias in it. Some of the cited references are not in the Bibliography, while, some of the lists of the Bibliography are not cited the main text, others are not properly listed. Please, refer to the original research article.	
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract is vigorous. Nevertheless, the statistical tool used in analyzing the data should be stated in the abstract	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tukur Muhammad
Department, University & Country	Zamfara State College of Education Maru, Nigeria