

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102415
Title of the Manuscript:	INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FROM THE BEGINNINGS OF CIVILIZATION TO 600 A.D.
Type of the Article	Minireview 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. Yes. The history of HE is essential for modern universities because new sciences, especially medicine, neglected traditional knowledge and understanding this knowledge can be a strong foundation for new sciences.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No. the abstract does not include a Statement about what the gap is in the research It also overlooked the research question/s / aim/s.</p> <p>4. I prefer that the subsections and structure of the manuscript are structured.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>Please explain the Minireview method completely with the strategy search.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, but overall editing seems necessary.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keywords need to be modified. - The theoretical framework of the discussion does not have enough information. 	

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:	Seyedeh Zahra Nahardani
Department, University & Country	Iran University of Medical Sciences, Iran