

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_98589
Title of the Manuscript:	Student Quality Circles in secondary schools
Type of the 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. Yes, clearly any article or paper done, can help scientific community and make it go forward since knowledge is gradually completed. 2. It is better to make the title somehow more specific by adding; for instance, a location, a zone, a region or...to show the exact place of studying...as suggested below: Student Quality Circles in secondary schools (case of study: secondary schools of....) 3. No, it is highly suggested to follow the general rule of paper/essay writing as mentioning the1) aim;2) methodology;3) population;4) sample and the way of sampling;5) tools for collecting data;6) validity and reliability of the inventory or tools;7) way of data analysis;8) findings(briefly) and 9) three to five keywords 4. This writing is not a research article nor a reviewing one. Also, numbering and making bullets have not been kept, there is no trace of research objectives, hypothesis questions, methodology and findings... 5. This writing must be revised completely if it wants to be gotten scientifically. 6. References are acceptable and appropriate. I, as the reviewer, suggest the respectful author(s) try to review instruction of your journal first and then, based on the instruction, start writing step by step in order to make/ have an appropriate/acceptable paper.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it can be suitable	
Optional/General comments	Using tables, graphs, figures and some other elements of an acceptable article/ paper can eventually make the author(s)'s work dominant	

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:	Zahra Arefnezhad
Department, University & Country	Parvin Secondary School for Girls, Iran