

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95303
Title of the Manuscript:	Formative feedback in reading comprehension
Type of the Article	Review 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<div>1. The manuscript is relevant for scientific community. However, the author (s) should consider the following points when writing a review article: a) It must give a comprehensive information on the topic. b) It should give a vivid explanation of the existing knowledge c) It must do well to identify gaps in the existing knowledge. d) It must also elaborate the useful methodologies. e) Personal feeling/sentiment must be avoided: For examples, the author(s) should avoid some expressions like: "...worrying results", "...not encouraging", etc. Please to the manuscript page 2. 2. The title is clear and suitable. 3. No. The abstract must be rewritten. The first sentence must be rewritten. "...it is the ability to read comprehension" It can be: ...it is the ability to read and understand" Also, instead of "search engines" the author(s), can consider opting for databases like Scopus, Web of Science. 4. The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript contributes to knowledge, but the author (s) should present a critical discussion without adding personal emotions. 6. The references are sufficient and relevant, but they are not well written. The author(s) should do well to rewrite the references legibly and adhere to the APA referencing style or a specific referencing style of the journal. 7. The author (s) are kindly requested to count in suggestions or recommendations for future research under the conclusion.</div>	Thanks for your comments
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of language is good. However, the author (s) should check subject-verb agreement, spellings and omission. For examples: a) "There are many research works on the subject, but it does not have..." b) Scholer , instead of Scholar (page 3), etc. Kindly refer to the manuscript	Thanks for your comments
Optional/General comments		

Comment [M1]: and understand.

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)	