

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_109501
Title of the Manuscript:	The Quality of Classroom instructions from student's perspectives
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The paper discusses students' perception of education quality among middle and higher secondary schools in Bhutan. This is a well-written manuscript that only needs to undergo a few changes.</p> <p>First, in terms of the title, author should refine the title to suit with the manuscript content. Secondly, in terms of abstract, it is dense with information and direction of the manuscript. One thing to improve in this abstract is at the sentence of "...312 students studying in class nine to class 12." Please decide either author want to use numerical or alphabetic to present the classes.</p> <p>Third, subsection and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. Fourth, I believe that the authors are too humble and can put forward their claims much more confidently. They draw on extensive empirical evidence and make a valuable contribution to the field. This can – and should – be highlighted much more! Fifth, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>And lastly, in the reference, the authors should link their empirical findings to the international literature at least in year 2022. This will also help them to emphasize their original research contribution. Still, the current year given is acceptable.</p> <p>In literature review, it will be more comprehensive if author provide theory related to cognitive development to support the study. I think it would be valuable to link and build on any of these theory in the manuscript.</p> <p>As for author's write up for result, please ensure the wording "Table 1" is the same as in the table provided and not be write as "table 1". Same goes to the other tables explanation. Advisable to put center the tables provided.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of language used in this manuscript is suitable for scholarly and academic writing.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In summary, author should be refining the title to suit with the manuscript content, improve their writing style and support their arguments with theory of cognitive development.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Syarifah Rabiya Al Adawiah Binti Syed Badrul Hisham</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UTMSPACE, Malaysia</b>