

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100059
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLICIT AND DIFFERENTIATED PHONICS INSTRUCTION ON PUPILS' LITERACY SKILLS IN GAMBIAN LOWER BASIC 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>I believe it is, but more input is required on the statistical analysis, the sourcing of information needs to be more thorough, certain sections need expansion and the referencing needs to be consistent.</p> <p>It needs editing to make it read better</p> <p>It is, but as with the main text, it needs editing to avoid the language quality issues mentioned in <i>Minor Revision Comments</i> below.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There are omissions</p> <p>There are minor consistent errors regarding spacing and capitalisation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is suitable though there are numerous errors which need correcting, mainly the use of conjunctions to improve coherence and cohesion and the avoidance of lexical repetition.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All the jargon needs explaining, while the incomprehensible sections, which have been highlighted, need addressing.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gareth Morgan
Department, University & Country	Macquarie University, UK