

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_116081
Title of the Manuscript:	Accessibility, Quality, and Significance of Education for Educationally Deprived Children
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community in education. 2. Yes, the title of the article suitable. 3. No, the abstract of the article comprehensive. So, a good abstract is a summary of the article. Most readers will read the abstract first to decide whether or not to read the entire article. Therefore, the abstract is very important from a good abstract presentation has the following main elements; 1) the abstract should begin with a theme sentence to let the reader know the main points as the article will present, this lead sentence should grab the reader's attention, 2) mention the purpose of the research, 3) mention the importance of the study in theory, and/or application, 4) discuss the research methods, 5) summarize the main findings, 6) mention new proposals, e.g., filling knowledge gaps, expanding the scope of knowledge, etc., 7) mention effective policy recommendations or developments. In this case, an improve the abstract of this article to short, clear, concise and complete, including of approximately 200-250 words. 4. No, a presentation in the introduction of the article (length approximately 500-1,000 words), which is comparable to "Executive summary" is a way to give the reader a succinct overview of the article and an expectation of what to find in it. The introduction must arouse the reader's interest. Therefore, an appropriate improvement of the introduction will have the following elements; 1) mention the main issue or main topic of this article, 2) after mentioning the main issue, it will go on the mention its importance to academic or use. So, the writer must try to point out to the reader, why the reader should read or pay attention to this article, 3) a synthetic summary as relevant literature (concepts, theories, research), selecting important, up-to-date works related to the article (Citations must be provided of references in the text), 4) authors must point out knowledge gaps, ambiguities and inconsistencies or doubts in the literature raised, this research wants to fill in or answer these questions, the author must explain that this article has the main contribution that will be useful to readers, and 5) the points out the important points of the article clearly and completely. And the literature review relates the sources used to the researcher's position, and demonstrates knowledge, understanding, and responses to knowledge and ideas. (with references). Therefore, the literature cited requires a systematic and clear ordering of the contents or texts with their relationships. 5. No, a adding into discussion section, a starting with a summary of the key findings leading to broader implications, the discussion demonstrates the reasoning of new knowledge, and the importance, of what has been learned from the study to consistency or relationship with past studies provides a reliable supporting framework, references sources for generalizations, and provides a framework for effective recommendations. a clearly the summary, which is a summary that does not overlap with the content, but is a summary of the issues and main points that are comprehensive, clear and complete. 6. Yes, the references sufficient and recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language reviews.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pornchai Jedaman
Department, University & Country	Rajabath Mahasarakham University, Thailand