

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99489
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON EDUCATION AND PSYCHO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AMONG SCHOOL STUDENTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN TWO ADJACENT BLOCKS IN NORTH 24 PARGANA DISTRICT OF WEST BENGAL, INDIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, as the COVID-19 pandemic has affected students worldwide. 2. Yes, it is. 3. Yes, it is. 4. Further work must be done with subsections. The Introduction is rather short. There is no Literature Review subsection and the Methodology subsection must be elaborated. In particular, it must be extended with full argumentation as to why this research design was selected. The author(s) must also comment on their sampling method, research tools, credibility and trustworthiness of the research. All these must be supported by relevant bibliography. 5. Should certain revisions are done, the manuscript can be scientifically correct. 6. Although the references are recent, they are not sufficient. Besides, there are minor inconsistencies between in-text citations and the list of references. Finally, the list of references must also be elaborated.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the manuscript must improve significantly. There are grammar and syntax mistakes. The author(s) must read and correct the language carefully so that the manuscript is well-communicated on a scholar level.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Calliope Tsantali
Department, University & Country	Greece