

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100263
Title of the Manuscript:	PROPOSALS OF QUATERLY THEMES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY EVALUATION SYSTEM IN SECONDARY EDUCATION IN CAMEROON
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes. The study depicts one of the common issues in the workplace in as far as teaching, learning and assessment are concerned.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes. It follows objectives-methods-results and discussion-conclusion scheme which makes it easy to understand.</p> <p>Yes. In the materials and methods section, the discussion should be unified. No need to label again and discuss separately the materials and methods (pp. 2-3).</p> <p>Yes. It is descriptive in nature and the presentation of results is fine.</p> <p>The references (32) are enough for this study.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes. Though it is still recommended for the paper to undergo stylistics and editing. In the discussion, avoid hyphen or bullet form presentation of responses (pp.7-8, Group 1 and Group 2 respectively).</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dennis G. Caballes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The National Teachers College, Philippines</b>