

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117644
Title of the Manuscript:	TIME PERSPECTIVES AND PERSONALITY TRAITS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS WITHIN DAVAO REGION: A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	

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> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript offers important insights into the relationship between time perspectives and personality traits, with implications for both theoretical understanding and practical applications. The findings not only contribute to our understanding of time perception and its implications but also have practical implications for counselling and educational interventions aimed at supporting students' well-being and academic success. The title is suitable as it stands, effectively summarizing the main focus and methodology of the study. However, minor adjustments for conciseness and engagement could enhance its appeal and readability. The title could be slightly more concise while retaining all necessary information. For example, "within the Davao Region" could be shortened to "in the Davao Region" without losing meaning. the abstract is comprehensive, covering the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, practical implications, and suggestions for future research. With minor revisions for brevity and specificity, it would provide an even clearer and more concise summary of the study. the abstract could be more concise. Some sentences could be streamlined to enhance readability without losing essential information. Specify the exact number of respondents or the sampling method While the mention of statistical methods is good, it might be beneficial to briefly state the main statistical findings (e.g., specific correlation regression or p-values) to give a clearer sense of the results' significance. Each subsection should be clearly titled and concisely written, avoiding unnecessary jargon and complexity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results should be integrated into the discussion meaningfully, linking back to the research questions and hypotheses stated in the introduction. These subsections should flow logically from one to the next, guiding the reader through the research process and findings. Each section should be clearly labelled and organized to facilitate understanding and interpretation. the manuscript seems scientifically correct, with appropriate research design, data analysis, and interpretation of findings. It looks too much. But the references provided seem sufficient and recent, the inclusion of additional references from diverse disciplines and geographical regions could further enrich the manuscript and strengthen its contribution to the scientific community. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written and effectively communicates the purpose, methodology, findings, and implications of the study. However, a thorough proofreading for grammar, punctuation, and clarity may further enhance the overall quality of the language in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript has many editorial issues. the methodology and result section needs to be summarized more.</p> <p>The results section is excessively detailed and over-explained. Additionally, some of the analysis is repeated in the discussion section. As a result, the results section should be more clear, concise, and well-analysed.</p> <p>Reformulate the objectives sentence structure in a clear and concise manner, the focus of the study becomes more apparent.</p> <p>It seems like there's a lot of detailed explanation and referencing in the results section, which can lead to redundancy and excessive elaboration. By condensing the explanations and focusing on the main findings, the results section becomes more concise while retaining its key points.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maylaf Hiruy Alemayehu
Department, University & Country	KDI School of Public Policy and Management, Ethiopia