

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99226
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of differentiated instruction in enhancing positive attitude towards learning STEM subjects: An Action research
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 may be of interest to the scientific community, particularly educators and researchers who are interested in exploring the impact of differentiated instruction on students' attitudes towards learning STEM subjects. 2. The article's focus on the use of differentiated instruction in enhancing positive attitudes towards learning STEM subjects is a relevant and important topic, and the study's use of action research adds value to its findings. 3. The abstract provides a brief overview of the study, but it may not be comprehensive enough to give a complete understanding of the research. The abstract does not provide details about the methodology or specific strategies used in differentiated instruction. It also does not mention the specific STEM subjects covered in the study, which may be relevant information for readers to evaluate the results. Additionally, the abstract does not mention any limitations or potential biases in the study, which would be helpful information for readers to understand the scope and validity of the findings. 4. The manuscript appears to have an appropriate subsection and structure to present the study's objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions effectively. 5. A more extensive and well-designed study with a larger sample size and a more rigorous methodology would be required to confirm the effectiveness of differentiated instruction in enhancing positive attitudes towards learning STEM subjects. 6. Based on the information provided in the manuscript, the references seem appropriate and relevant to the study.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality seems sufficient for scholarly communication, but it may be beneficial for the authors to have a native English speaker or a professional editor review the manuscript before submitting it to a journal.	
Optional/General comments	With some revisions, the manuscript has potential to be a valuable contribution to the field.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hansi Effendi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia