

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_121565
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSROOM STRUCTURE SCHEMES OF TEACHERS AND LANGUAGE COMMUNICATION DIFFICULTIES OF STUDENTS IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical area of educational research namely, the relationship between classroom structure schemes and language communication difficulties among secondary school students. Understanding this relationship can inform more effective teaching strategies, which are vital for improving students' outcomes, particularly in diverse educational settings. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on a relevant and underexplored topic to contribute valuable insights to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES, the title of the article is suitable, but they might also try alternative title to better capture the essence of the study: "IMPACT OF CLASSROOM STRUCTURE SCHEMES ON LANGUAGE COMMUNICATION CHALLENGES AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN DAVAO CITY."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	YES, it is comprehensive. I would like to suggest some points to add in abstract for more comprehensive vision of the manuscript. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Avoid repetitive phrases or words to make it more precise and readable. ➤ To improve clarity, consider rephrasing the sentence "The finding disclosed that the extent of language communication difficulties of secondary school students was manifested oftentimes by the teacher" ➤ Try to include a brief statement on the implications of the findings for educational practice and policy. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized. The paper includes clear sections for the abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and discussion, conclusion and recommendations. The methodology section provides clear descriptions of the research design, respondents, instrument, data gathering procedure, and data analysis. This structured approach facilitates a coherent narrative that is easy to follow and understand.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its use of appropriate research methodologies, including a non-experimental quantitative research design and correlation analysis. ➤ The manuscript uses validated instruments and appropriate statistical methods such as mean, Pearson r and regression analysis strengthens the reliability and validity of the findings. ➤ The manuscript aligns well with established theories and previous research that supporting its scientific validity. ➤ Ethical considerations and informed consent procedures were also appropriately addressed. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and included some recent works. However, consider some additional recent studies and reviews that addresses the themes of classroom management, language communication difficulties and educational intervention. For instance, incorporating works such as Marzano, R. J., (2003) on classroom management that works, Cummins, J. (2017) on teaching minorized students, Hattie, J. (2009) on visible learning and Echevarria & Graves (2014) on sheltered content instruction would provide valuable insights and support the study's findings.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally sufficient but require several revisions to meet the standards of scholarly communication. While the manuscript successfully conveys the core ideas, there are areas where clarity, consistency, and formality need improvement. I recommend, a thorough proofreading and editing process to address these issues. This will not only improve the manuscript's readability but also ensure it aligns with the expectations of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Repetitive words or sentences are highlighted in turquoise colour. ➤ Sentences are vague and unclear are highlighted in Bright green. Should be revised for clarity. ➤ Incorrect values are highlighted in pink. ➤ Headings in the table are not bold are highlighted in dark yellow. ➤ Improper in-text citation and incorrect APA formatting in the references section are highlighted in yellow. ➤ Check your language. ➤ Add some recent studies published within the last five years to provide valuable insight ➤ Mentioning figure 1 without including it in the section is confusing. Ensure that the figure is placed appropriately. ➤ Consider providing a summary of how the data was collected before discussing the results to help the reader follow the logical progression of the study. ➤ Mention how informed consent was obtained and how confidentiality was maintained throughout the study. 	

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:	Anniejemijonafer F
Department, University & Country	Vellore Institute of Technology (VIT), India