

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_127254
Title of the Manuscript:	Empowering Futures: STEM Aspirations Among Bangladeshi Girls in Secondary Education
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	In light of limited involvement in STEM and the need for women involvement in science and technology education, this study seem timely in ensuring gender equality, as this underscore a strong focus SDG 2030. This work therefore explores how aspiration may inform this limited involvement and which may set up potential action for remediation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is suitable	
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.	No. There is need for both rework and editorial. I suggest the authors start with the main issues the precipitated the study. This should then dovetail towards the gap the study seek to fill. The second paragraph should purely revolves around methodological issues. Including brief description of instrument used as well as the qualitative input. The next paragraph should reflect result while the last points to recommendation or implications	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The background seems too short. Although the statement of problem was explicit and did well to support the introduction. Importantly, the sub-section looks very accurate and build on each other.	
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.	The study require a lot of rework as there seem to be contradictions across the methodology. At first, there was claim to intending use of survey design, apart from the the fact that the study was not reported as passive one, yet, it lack in terms of design...as the study also utilised FGDs to collect data from respondents. What the researcher meant by survey format	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are up-to-date	
Minor REVISION comments	Not good enough.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I think there is need for the author to rework the manuscript. Although, several visuals were placed, it is difficult to align each with the objective set of the study. The analyses and report should come after each objective or research questions, in order to improve clarity. Major Revision.	

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:	Jamiu Agbolade Ogunsola
Department, University & Country	Fountain University, Osogbo