

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_112531
Title of the Manuscript:	Model of Excellent Educational Systems: Qualitative Data Analysis
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 based on '**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://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 the Reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write their feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a 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 suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) This manuscript is vital in education, with a negligible impact on the scientific community</p> <p>2) Proposed Model for the Excellent Educational System: Overview of the Field</p> <p>3) The abstract has more than 250 words</p> <p>4) The Reviewer suggests avoiding the third level of subsections</p> <p>5) This manuscript is not on an adequate academic or methodological level</p> <p>6) The list of References is not provided correctly. At least the author has to type the correct article titles and journal names.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, (Poor English), the manuscript has many spelling/Typing and Grammar mistakes, overuse of sentences in passive voice (more than 50), and unclear sentences.</p> <p>Writing in the first person or giving information on the author's gender is improper in the scientific field.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the first stage, the editorial manager must return this manuscript to the author for correction in English.</p> <p>The author must know that the Widows Programme has tools for this aim.</p> <p>There is also a possibility of using the Grammarly Editor – Premium +.</p> <p>The Reviewer is not English-speaking, so the editor is suggested to invite someone who can have a better understanding and comprehension if the Grammarly Editor is insufficient.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miloš Popović
Department, University & Country	University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia