

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127426
Title of the Manuscript:	Communication Capacities And Mutual Connection System Of Teachers In Public Elementary Schools
Type of the Article	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>

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.	I can say I love this topic even though, it is essential for conducting such a topic for a particular context.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This topic is good and projected to investigate the relationships and impacts between both variables. It had better to be honed a bit narrow than the presented one, even better to provide a clear context since this topic is not a brand new, being hit by the scholars of the time beings.	
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.	It is on the right way by providing clear aims. However, there are some points to hone as the following: -Raising all constructs of both independent and dependent variables (not necessary) -Don't provide the statistic after computation for testifying. (correlation, p-value and regression) -It looks contrasting the findings (null hypothesis) and the author mentioned in the result section that the IVs don't have influences on DV. -Author provided the implications, but did not tell the limitation and future direction	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There was not literature review that is one of the important parts in which the gaps of preview research were revealed; therefore, I have to assert that its structure is not appropriate.	
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.	It did not follow the scientific research format (5 main sections). Cordially, regardless abstract, it could start with Introductory, Literature, Methodology, Result, Discussion and Conclusion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It should add more references because there are more similar papers	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language use is advanced level, seeming that the author has used the writing application to help; moreover, the serious plagiarism should conduct seriously in the epoch of AI.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript needs major revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revision the abstract - Add literature Review with appropriate sub-section in order to form the framework - Relocate the conceptual frame work - No need to mention the reference in Methodology, except that it related to instrument adjustment, special analysis method (please concise it) - Give more data evidence and re-structure - In result section, author should interpret the data perfectly depending on the aim and what criteria for each stage. Author has to attach the instruments and raw data for this manuscript, or he or she can extract appropriate statistic, required by procedural norms to interpret, avoiding quoting unnecessary bullet for elaborations. (Re-consider) - Conclusion should be more informative and cutting-edged (Please recheck about the inclusion and abstract) 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Doung Dara</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Mindset Development Organization, Cambodia</p>