

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_128055
Title of the Manuscript:	Measuring the Students' Practice of 21st Century Skills in a Philippine Catholic Senior High School
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript identified certain skills that are relevant for 21st-century global workplace among senior school students and extent to which they were practice or demonstrated. It investigated the relationship between 21st Century skills practice and the demographic variables of the study sampled. Suggestions on how improvements could be made were documented in the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article suitable for the study	
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.	In the abstract, there's is need to include population of the study, research instrument, validity of the instrument and reliability of the instrument. The conclusion should be reviewed in line with the findings of the study. One major recommendation should be included.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, there is a mix up between conclusion and recommendations. The author(s) need to provide information on both of them as a separate subheading.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. However, there is inconsistent way of citing authors in the study. The author(s) need to be consistent. There are occasions where names of authors are not listed while in names are listed (see discussions under relationship)	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality of the article is suitable but it can still be improved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Information provided under conclusion is more of recommendations and not conclusion of the study. The author(s) need to review this. Conclusion must be based on findings of the study and same goes for the recommendations. Also, the author(s) need to make sure that discussion follows each of the tables presented. The idea of discussing the results in the table before actual presentation of the table make it difficult and disjointed for the readers. This arrangement should be looked into	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oyerinde David Oluseyi
Department, University & Country	Ekiti State University, Nigeria