

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_119447
Title of the Manuscript:	ESSENTIAL SOFT SKILLS AND CLASSROOM MANAGERIAL EFFICIENCY OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This issues is very crucial, evergreen and relevant issues for everyone and everywhere. Every teacher should soft and managerial skill or efficiency for leading the diverse classroom. Without quality education no one country could not be its all round development where teacher is the main actor of this aspect thus it is necessary that he should be skillfull. Therefore it will be helpful for scientific study.</p> <p>2. It would be better if it is a bit short otherwise it is best.</p> <p>3. In the abstract all content are included and integrated.</p> <p>4. Generally the structure of the manuscript is good but in the methodology chapter there are subtopic but it is not seen necessary to divide it. It would be better in single paragraph. Similarly there is lack of theoretical review.</p> <p>5. It is correct.</p> <p>6. Most of References and citation are recent after 2020 and some are before 2020. There is no date in the article so it made confusing when the article was published.</p> <p>7. There is no similarity in theme font, letter size and line spacing, whether Arial and whether Helvetica. So it is necessary to maintain similarity.</p> <p>8. Lack of Theoretical Review</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It seems like academic writing. It is concise, readable, and academic and its language is reader oriented.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In overall manuscript is ok. It will be better if you have analysed in detail content in result and discussion section and focus on latest citation</p>	

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:	Tej Bahadur Khadka
Department, University & Country	Nepal