

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_105509
Title of the Manuscript:	Instructional Scaffolding Strategies for Teaching Writing in General Public School
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community as the study offers insights into the use of instructional scaffolding strategies in writing classes to improve students' writing performance in the teaching and learning context in Philippines.</p> <p>The title of the article is not clear; as it is too broad. Who benefits from this study?</p> <p>The abstract is not yet comprehensive as it cannot give a clear picture of participants in the study.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are proper. Yes, I do.</p> <p>The references are not yet sufficient and recent. More recent studies are missing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language use is understandable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The candidate is encouraged to revise for review before the manuscript is processed for publication as the writing style is not quite academic.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Huan Nguyen
Department, University & Country	School of Foreign Languages, Can Tho University, Vietnam