

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)	Yes, important! But, does not follow proper Action research format. Enhancing positive attitude towards learning STEM subjects through differentiated instruction Yes, but lacks specificity in the sampling though sampling is not appropriate word in Action Research. Partially yes correct. I doubt as differentiated instruction is proven by many scholars to benefit all students from instruction. No sufficient references used. Yet, the references are not recent enough.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Really suitable to scholarly communications.	
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:	Melaku Anteneh Mekonnen
Department, University & Country	Woldia University, Ethiopia