

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_102396
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFICIENCY LEVEL AND CHALLENGES IN ECONOMICS OF GRADE 10 STUDENTS IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN CENTRAL PHILIPPINES
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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. <i>The manuscript is important for scientific community. The study will contribute toThe presentation of the result is of good quality.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The title is slightly amended.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The abstract is comprehensive.</i></p> <p>4. <i>The subsection and structure are not largely appropriate and suggestions for revisions are offered.</i></p> <p>5. <i>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</i></p> <p>6. <i>The references are sufficient and largely recent.</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. <i>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><i>It is essential that the research hypothesis be clearly stated and not just made reference to in the results.</i></p> <p><i>The Tables need to be placed at locations not very far from where they are made references unto.</i></p> <p><i>KEY.</i></p> <p><i>Red highlight = Delete</i></p> <p><i>Red text = Observation/Comment</i></p> <p><i>Blue text = Correction</i></p> <p><i>Underlined text = Marked for revision</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aderemi Moses Adewale
Department, University & Country	Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education, Nigeria