

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_92900
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable education: Restoring dignity of communities in the classrooms and beyond
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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	Despite the fact that one can indirectly deduce what the author wanted to try in the article, the very result of this effort is questionable. The author mentions several studies and surveys, and one can only hope that one of them is the author's own (?). If this is the case, the entire methodology of this own survey, its specific results and their conclusions must be described precisely. Overall, the article sounds like an attempt to incorporate as many different ideas as possible into the text, but these are disjointed, and some are repeated multiple times. Many are listed without a deeper connection with the rest of the text or the researched topic. The level of English is very low in many passages of the article. The text is difficult to understand in many places, or even incomprehensible at all.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are some formal and grammar imperfections, such as missing spaces between the words or sentences; missing punctuation marks (e.g., full stop at the end of a sentence); many abbreviations are not explained; inappropriately presented citations (cited sources) in the body of paper; etc. The author states: "...has been discussed in section 3." However, the sections in this paper are not numbered, and therefore it is quite difficult to navigate the paper. The mentioned "Section 3" is possibly a remnant of the marking of the text in the previous version of the description of the conducted research (in another article? in another qualification thesis?).	
Optional/General comments	Based on the fact that the article is really very interesting and deserves the attention of readers, I recommend the author to substantially harmonize the article, improve the quality of English and concretize the empirical (methodological) part about the author's own research and the specific contribution/s of the entire article. Good luck!	

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:	Martina Blašková
Department, University & Country	Police Academy of the Czech Republic, Czech Republic