

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99586
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of academic results between fully autonomous and non-autonomous schools.
Type of the Article	Short 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)	School information can be given in the summary section. In the methodology, it is possible to specify the criteria by which the selected schools were selected. Why were elective courses excluded? A valid reason must be written. In the data analysis section, the findings were correlated, but not specified in the method section. Has the post hoc test been applied within the Anova test? What are the results? The discussion part is not enough. It should be supported by current studies. References should be reviewed according to journal writing rules. It will be a study that will contribute to the literature.	
Minor REVISION comment 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	This is a good research. Although I'm concerned about the short follow-up period.	

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:	Taner Yilmaz
Department, University & Country	Uşak University, Türkiye