

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97175
Title of the Manuscript:	ADJUSTMENT OF STUDENTS TO THE TERTIARY LANDSCAPE: THE DYNAMIC INFLUENCE OF PSYCHOSOCIAL EDUCATION
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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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 it is important for the research community since it focuses on the successful adjustment of university students.</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is well articulated with the subheadings well labelled.</p> <p>The subsections are appropriately labelled. However, the statement of problem is too generalized and rather long. It needs to be focused on one specific problem at the site of study.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct. But it could be better if the sample size was increased since it is a quantitative study. There is need to explain the formula used and rational behind using a sample of only 257 out of 44 548. There is need to edit the figures for population and percentages, Need to be consistent/ References are good, but there is need to add few more current sources</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>Language is good and of high standard.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There is need to explain the return rate from 380 to 257 findings, 65.4 percent of the entire population.</p> <p>There is need to be consistent with figures eg Population is recorded as 44584 And at another point as 44 548</p> <p>Again there is lack of consistency in these figures below,</p> <p>Despite the positive outcomes of psychosocial education, 35.5 percent of respondents said ????? d 34.6 percent of the total sample size. Which of these two figure????</p>	

**Comment [CC1]:** There is need to be consistent about This figure and the last stated figure

**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>Constance Chifamba</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Solusi University, Zimbabwe</b>