

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_94220
Title of the Manuscript:	MELCs-Based Strategic Intervention Materials (SIMS) for Araling Panlipunan 5
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The author should improve the introduction by avoiding one sentence paragraph.as it is.</p> <p>What is captured as a statement of the problem is not the problem. The author should remove the title 'statement of the problem and should join with the background. Should however remove all the 3.3.1 etc</p> <p>Remove 2 written with materials and methods</p> <p>The design is better written, to show which actual design is used,[i think its a mixed method design] The instrument for data collection should be indicated in each stage. This is however indicated later in the body but i think it should be summarised clearly under the Research design.</p> <p>Locale of the study should be removed and other sectional heads to show it is a journal article and not a dissertation/thesis</p> <p>The author needs to review the paragraphing style in use. Two or three paragraphs can be put together instead of separating small paragraphs under the same section. This should be done all over the article</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The tables should be presented before referring to it in the discussion.</p> <p>I think the work will be better if clear discussion of results/findings is separated</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sariat Adalakun
Department, University & Country	Federal College of Education Special, Nigeria