

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_98513</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Access to quality education, a basic right of every child</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Policy Article</b>

### 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially for Indian society.  2. The title is suitable and suits the content.  3. The abstract is comprehensive and easily understood.  4. All the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but the content under the subsection "Quality school education: Issues and challenges" should be discussed in a paragraph and NOT in point form without any explanations.  5. The manuscript is scientifically correct as a whole. The authors support their statements by giving data and reports. Only some parts need to put the citations (refer to the marked manuscript)  6. The references are relevant and sufficient.  7. Add the suggestions for future studies in Conclusion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Chew Fong Peng</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Malaya, Malaysia</b>