

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJESS_91481
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical Analysis of Misfiling Causes in Higher Education: A Test Construction
Type of the Item	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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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 REVIEW comments	<p>Theme: Statistical analysis of the causes that give rise to errors in the files of higher education. A test build. This would be a suggestion for better directionality of the topic. It can be considered as original, since this study is carried out for the first time in this institution. Not so, in general terms since there are studies on the subject as referenced within the text.</p> <p>Summary. This section (objective - methodology - results - conclusions) is usually done in a single paragraph; each element mentioned is developed within the writing taking into account the punctuation marks. As found it seems conceptualizations. The objective of the research is missing. The Introduction does not go in this section. The methodology, results and conclusions are consistent. I suggest you take into account the suggestion.</p> <p>Keywords: The UNESCO THESAURS allows establishing a glossary of universal terms that facilitate the location of the article within the academy. Therefore, it is important to work with this tool: HIGHER EDUCATION – FILES - TECHNIQUES – STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY...</p> <p>Introduction: The problem is developed correctly; the study is justified in good form; the objective and the hypothesis of the study are appropriate for the topic to work on. The section is relevant.</p> <p>Materials and methods: The proposed design is experimental - controlled; the population of the sample is conducive and pertinent with the relevance of the consent and the information given in an adequate manner, this allows the results to be relevant; the environment and location of the investigation is relevant as well as the techniques used at the statistical level. Well worked.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: The results reveal certain reliability data that respond to the questions raised. You can see a clear x-ray of how the university archive is in its form and substance, as well as the emotional state of those who work in these spaces. The results are compared with other authors who preceded the investigation, these are important when highlighting the findings. The relevance of the research and the contribution that in this case is given to the educational center and therefore extends to other institutions is clearly noted. It would be important to indicate if there were difficulties or not at the time of the study.</p> <p>Conclusions: The conclusion reveals the coherence with the stated objective and its contribution at an educational and social level. In addition, future lines of research are proposed that could well go into the discussion.</p> <p>Bibliographic references: Being a little worked subject, the references would seem to be correct. It is always suggested that they be at least between 40 – 50 to support the study. However, in this case it is acceptable for the above.</p>	
Minor REVIEW comments	THE STUDY IS IMPORTANT AND THE FINDINGS GENERATE CONTRIBUTIONS NOT ONLY AT THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL BUT SOCIALLY. I SUGGEST ITS PUBLICATION ALWAYS AND WHEN THE SUGGESTIONS GIVEN ARE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.	
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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador