

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_112531</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Model of Excellent Educational Systems: Qualitative Data Analysis</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is fairly important for the scientific, offering summative insights and contributing somewhat to the field. It can serve as a basis for future literature reviews.</p> <p>2. The title of the article should be rephrased and corrected in terms of language.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear and concise summary of the key findings and contributions of the article.</p> <p>4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized. However, the paragraphs are short and there is no real discussion or comparison between the cited resources. The author cites only one reference in each paragraph whereas she should set up a debate on the topic from the literature.</p> <p>5. The manuscript can be scientifically challenged as the author took its data from "Google", which raises questions of accuracy and reliability in its methodology and results. The author should have analyzed papers from well-known databases such as Scopus.com or Web of Science, etc.</p> <p>6. The references are both recent. Additional references could enhance the depth of the manuscript.</p> <p>7. The author should discuss the implications of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is intermediate. There are issues with the use of the definite article for instance. As a result, the paper language should be revised by a native speaker.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdessamad Binaoui
Department, University & Country	Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Morocco