

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_114656
Title of the Manuscript:	Principal Component Analysis of Cognitive Executive Functions as Predictors of Academic Performance of Students in Mathematics
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>)

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, it is important for scientific community as the skills that make up executive function are better predictors of success than test scores, IQ, or socioeconomic status. Executive function is the brain's air traffic controller, intercepting a tangle of thoughts and impulses and steering them toward safe, productive outcomes</p> <p>2. Yes, suitable title</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Need some improvements in sections and subsections(mentioned in the review)</p> <p>5. Yes, it is scientifically accurate</p> <p>6. Already mentioned in review</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes suitable for communication. Corrected spelling and tense mistakes where possible</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments are mentioned in the attached review file</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:	Menahal
Department, University & Country	University of Health Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan