

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100026
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYZING SHOOTING MEASUREMENTS IN FOOTBALL: AN EXHAUSTIVE REVIEW AND NOVEL FINDINGS
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>May be important, but not conducted properly.</p> <p>Not suitable. Shooting "Measurement" or Shooting "Performance"</p> <p>No, methods, results and conclusions cannot be distinguished in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes, but objectives missing</p> <p>See my comments below</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	ok	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Formatting and alignment not proper</p> <p>Need more explanation in method section</p> <p>Statement of the problem, objectives are not clearly mentioned.</p> <p>Background of the study is not coherent, add proper justifications in the introduction</p> <p>Findings are not clearly presented</p> <p>Add tables</p> <p>Add figures</p> <p>Lack of suggestions for further research</p> <p>Lack of practical implications of the research</p> <p>Conclusion is too long</p> <p>Add limitations if any</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Tomar
Department, University & Country	King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, Saudi Arabia