

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_114369</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Recipes For Happiness: Conversations On Happiness And Well-Being In The School Environment</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Opinion Article</b>

### 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially for development research in the fields of education and psychology for children.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable and interesting</p> <p>3. Abstracts do not clearly show the methods and data sources used, for example how many students' works were analyzed.</p> <p>4. In terms of structure, the manuscript can be read well and the subsections are in accordance with the subtitles created</p> <p>5. Yes, it is scientifically correct because the researcher provides theoretical explanations from research results and relevant books</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and up to date</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 in the article is suitable and communicative for readers, but it is best in the results and discussion chapters, especially to clarify the "theme" material being analyzed, make a table that informs what categories are in each theme to make it easier for readers to understand the text analyzed in the article</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the writing in this article is good. already contains relevant theories, methods and discussion results. For clarity, the data used in this article should be explained further.</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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rischa Hudzaimi Zulfah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia</b>