

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is relevant for scientific community. However, the author (s) should consider the following points when writing a review article:</p> <p>a) It must give a comprehensive information on the topic.</p> <p>b) It should give a vivid explanation of the existing knowledge</p> <p>c) It must do well to identify gaps in the existing knowledge.</p> <p>d) It must also elaborate the useful methodologies.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2. The title is clear and suitable.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4. The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript contributes to knowledge, but the author (s) should present a critical discussion without adding personal emotions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7. The author (s) are kindly requested to count in suggestions or recommendations for future research under the conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of language is good. However, the author (s) should check subject-verb agreement, spellings and omission.</p> <p>For examples:</p> <p>a) "There are many research works on the subject, but it does not have..."</p> <p>b) Scholer , instead of Scholar (page 3), etc. Kindly refer to the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Owusu Tabiri
Department, University & Country	Ghana Communication Technology University, Ghana