

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJL2C_110048</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Relationship Between Authoritative Parenting and Student Discipline at Madrasah Ibtidaiyah</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>It is important since the topic uncovers relationship between authoritative parenting and student discipline is a subject of interest or concern in the field of education or psychology and it offers new insights, perspectives, or empirical evidence that adds to the existing body of knowledge on parenting styles and their impact on student behaviour.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract provides a brief overview of the research, but it could be improved if the author/s can provide the aspects of what student discipline are being considered. Also providing a clearer statement of the research question or hypothesis would enhance the abstract's clarity.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript appears to have a scientific structure and follows the conventions of academic writing</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some areas that could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down for better clarity. Ensure that each sentence conveys a single, clear idea.</li> <li>Adding transition phrases between sentences and paragraphs can improve the overall flow of the text.</li> <li>Maintain consistency in verb tenses, especially when describing methods and presenting results.</li> <li>Ensure a consistently formal and academic tone throughout the manuscript. Some parts may sound a bit informal.</li> <li>Consider using subheadings more consistently to clearly delineate different sections of the article.</li> <li>When presenting results, be precise in explaining what the findings mean. In the discussion section, relate the results directly to the research question and hypothesis.</li> <li>In the conclusion, restate the main findings and how they address the research question. Offer a clear summary of the implications of the study.</li> <li>Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>John Michael V. Sasan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Philippines</b>