

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_120491
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSROOM LEADERSHIP COMMUNICATION CAPABILITIES AND COMMUNAL INTERFACE OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is important to know the relationship of classroom leadership communication capabilities and communal interface of teachers. 2. The title should be: <u>The relationship of classroom leadership communication capabilities and communal interface of teachers in public elementary schools.</u> 3. The abstract is comprehensive, but contradicts the research results. 4. The manuscript should contain a hypothesis 5. Yes, if the title is changed as number 2 above. 6. Sufficient. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract it says <u>there was significant relationship</u> between the level of communication capabilities and communal interface of teachers hence, there is rejection of null hypothesis. This contradicts the results of the analysis and conclusions that state <u>there is no significant relationship</u> between the level of leadership communication capabilities and communal interface hence, there is acceptance of null hypothesis. Please revise the abstract according to the research results. 2. This research tests the hypothesis, so it must write the hypothesis sentence to be tested. 3. In Tables 1 and 2 there are Descriptive Equivalent. There needs to be an explanation of the criteria for determining the Descriptive Equivalent: High = ... - ... Moderate = ... - 4. The sentences in the paragraphs below Table 1 and Table 2 should not be sentences explaining the meaning of the table contents, but explanations of the meaning of each item value. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jafriansen Damanik
Department, University & Country	Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Indonesia