

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JESBS_99706 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | THE ROLE OF MOTHER GODDESS WORSHIP IN SPIRITUAL CULTURE LIFE OF PEOPLE IN LAM DONG PROVINCE – VIET NAM |
| 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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, it is. The subject of the article is quite good indeed. But it will be much better if the writer could find a good proof-reader. 2. It is quite understandable. 3. It is expected that the writer can reformulate his/her abstract. An abstract should give (1) an introduction about the context of the paper which motivates this research article; (2) a statement that outlines the purpose of the paper; (3) the method used in the research's procedures and data analyses; (4) the findings of the research; and (5) a conclusion that points the wider implications of the research. 4. It is acceptable. 5. I think so. 6. It is alright. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | 1. There must be a good proof-reader for the article. | |
| 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Raymundus I Made Sudhiarsa |
| Department, University & Country | Widya Sasana School of Philosophy and Theology, Indonesia |