

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_119988
Title of the Manuscript:	Student Attitudes on School Climate and Learning Engagement in Physics of Senior High School Students
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. The subject matter is very interesting and relevant.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Mostly, but there are no recommendations to close out the abstract</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Probably, but the methods section is not clear enough to make a definitive determination on that.</p> <p>6. Several grey lit references (1, 3, 4, 8 [Scribbr? Really???]); references are largely incorrect, no matter what format you're using (ResearchGate.net URLs rather than DOIs, (2022b) with no (2022a); shorturl.at listed instead of DOIs)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. The writing is very unclear, filled with grammar errors, and repetitive. Table callouts are mostly incorrect. The writing is of such poor quality that the message is lost.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think the project is a good one, but the methods are not clearly explained, the results seem to tack on additional lit review material for no reason and with no connection to the results, the connection between the quantitative and qualitative results is not at all clear, and the recommendations do not seem to link to the results (if they do, it is not made clear in the narrative). WAY too many themes (18?) which makes the thematic map a total mess—there's no way a reader is going to take the time to untangle that message.</p>	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mitchel Stimers
Department, University & Country	Park University, U.S.A