

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127429
Title of the Manuscript:	STRATEGIES FOR EMERGING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND INTERPERSONAL FIELD OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	

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.	The study effectively addresses the objective and presents the paper well. It focuses on the role of instructional materials that teachers can use to develop interpersonal skills, enhance the active teaching-learning process, and motivate and improve student engagement. Ultimately, the findings of the study will contribute to improving the quality of education.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is fine.	
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.	Abstract is written well.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Yes. It is appropriate. I notice some corrections in sections that must be incorporated before publishing. They are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Section 3.1, line 7, the word "assessment" is repeated (it should be replaced with the variable "research"). 2. In Section 3.2, Table 2 shows the overall mean value as '3.85', but in the text, it is written as '3.91' 	
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 has used three methods to achieve the objectives: weighted mean, pearson r and multiple regression analysis and they have efficiently shows the relation between variables. But authors have not mentioned the hypotheses. Mentioning hypotheses helps readers to stay on track.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Including the latest references would improve the relevance and value of the paper. Only five studies are from 2020–2024, three of which are from 2024. Try to add more studies from 2020–2023	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Suggestions to improve the quality of the paper: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The research gap has not been addressed anywhere. Explaining it would help readers correlate the past and present work, and clearly highlight the contribution of the current research study.2. Section 2.3 should provide more factual data on the development of the instrument. For example, how many research articles were reviewed to identify variables, how many initial variables were found, and how many were finalized for data collection. Additionally, it should mention how many experts were involved in the face and content validity process and the sample size for pilot testing.3. The software or application used for data analysis or calculation must be mentioned in 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Parvati Agrahari
Department, University & Country	University of Allahabad, India