

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97541
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Influential Factors in COVID-19 Handling in Socialist and Democratic Capitalism Countries</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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>1. YES. It is important for researchers in the area of Applied Social Sciences and philosophy.</p> <p>2. NO. We suggest: Evaluation of the handling of the COVID-19 Pandemic in Capitalist and Socialist countries: A Systematic Review</p> <p>3. NO. The abstract is confusing, and some parts are repetitive. we suggest some changes, indicated in red color.</p> <p>4. YES</p> <p>5. NO. Suggestions were made in the manuscript, which is attached.</p> <p>6. Suggestions were made in the manuscript, which is attached.</p> <p><b>Additional suggestions/comments</b></p> <p>1. Title: Change suggestion made.</p> <p>2. The abstract is confusing, and some parts are repetitive.</p> <p>3. For the introduction, only the 12 articles chosen for the systematic review could be included.</p> <p>4. Introduction is inadequate. For a Systematic Review, the introduction should include only the articles that will be part of the study.</p> <p>5. Methodology. The authors did not contemplate the methodological description of a Systematic Review.</p> <p>6. Results. They should include only the articles that will be included in the Systematic Review.</p> <p>7. Discussion. As the results are inadequate, there is nothing to discuss.</p> <p>8. Conclusion. As the results are inadequate, there is nothing to conclude.</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><b>I suggest that an English language expert do the spelling and grammar check.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>We have the impression that the authors do not master the methodology of preparing a Systematic Review. For the proposed theme, a Narrative Literature Review could be done.</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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valmin Ramos Da Silva
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual De Minas Gerais, Brazil