

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96720
Title of the Manuscript:	Washback Effects of High-Stakes Test: Perspectives of Economics Teachers and Students
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript os impo to the community since perceptions are vital. The title is not clear and doesn't explain the part of implementating the economics syllabus, that was a big part of the methodology. The author could rearrange and start with " Perceptions of Teachers and students on High stake tests and their effects The abstract doesn't explain the problem and the location. The sub sections and structure of the manuscript, are appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically correct given the large sample size of 700 respondents. References are sufficient but some need to be corrected.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Generally, the English language is suitable for scholarly communication but in some places the author needs to remove some unveryfiable words like " revelation".	
Optional/General comments	The research problem is not clearly stated in the problem statement,as well as the knowledge gap. There need to be a good background about the high stake tests. Also, knowing that these tests are used by administrators and in work places, the study needs to come out clearly on thr relationship with the work and study by both respondents. The methodology needs to present and explain full descriptions of the information,not just mean and standard deviations.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victoria Kakooza
Department, University & Country	Kyambogo University, Uganda