

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102386
Title of the Manuscript:	Self-Esteem and Locus of Control as Correlates of Academic Achievement among Secondary School Students in Anambra State
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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes it is. Academic performance among students in mathematics has been a challenge to many students, not just in Nigeria but in other countries too. This study will therefore help the scientific community in identifying factors that need to be addressed in order to boost performance in the subject.</p> <p>2. The title may need to be clear that the focus is male students. It may be necessary to include.....Anambra State, Nigeria</p> <p>3. It is fairly comprehensive though nothing it is not clear when the researcher talks about male students and then switches to talk about both gender in another objective</p> <p>4. The researcher would have included other subsections like the problem statement and literature review</p> <p>5. Yes, in my opinion the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are generally current, what is not very current are generally policies which stand until revised</p> <p>The researcher has done a good job in this paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is, but there may be need for editing for tenses and minor language errors</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work is generally good, well researched and quite relevant in Scientific research. There is need to beef up the conclusion though.</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:	Naomi N. Makau
Department, University & Country	South Eastern Kenya University, Kenya