

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117705
Title of the Manuscript:	A Descriptive-Correlational Study on the Relationship between English Proficiency and Reading Comprehension of Elementary Pupils
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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. This manuscript can provide a valuable information about the relationship between English proficiency and Reading comprehension.</p> <p>2. I think the title could be "A Descriptive-Correlational Study between English Proficiency and Reading Comprehension of Elementary Pupils". The word "Relationship" is not necessary because Correlational Study already explain about it.</p> <p>3. Yes. The abstract appears to provide a comprehensive overview of the study. It outlines the research objectives, methodology, sample size, instruments used, key findings, and implications. It succinctly communicates the main points of the study</p> <p>4. I have provided the comment in the original manuscript.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. Maybe the writer can update the references so it would enrich his articles.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and quality of English in the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The article discusses research findings, utilizes academic terminology, and references relevant scholarly sources. The use of statistical analysis and validation procedures further indicates a rigorous academic approach. Overall, the language and quality of the article align with the standards of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have provided the comment in the original manuscript. Please take a look on the original manuscript.</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:	Jusak Patty
Department, University & Country	Pattimura University, Indonesia