

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_117521</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND CLASSROOM CLIMATE AS PREDICTORS OF METACOGNITIVE SKILLS IN ENGLISH SUBJECTS AMONG JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable?</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>the topic is important</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Needs improvement</p> <p>They need to be improved</p> <p>As the literature review is limited and there is no discussion section, a substantial literature is missing</p> <p>There is a mismatch between the title and the abstract- If the authors predict or correlate those concepts might not be clearly understood by reading the title and the abstract. Causality does not mean prediction. If you have done a regression analysis- then you had better revising the abstract</p> <p>Are you taking English as a foreign, second or native language?</p> <p>Almost no literature reviewed for parental involvement and metacognition. On the figure, there are components of parental involvement- better to explain those and how they might relate to MC. Also MC needs elaboration since its is the dependent variable</p> <p>Method: Authors should explain which research design was employed to run this study? Simply putting quantitative may not be sufficient. Research design section needs revision</p> <p>Data collection tools: The study aims to examine MC skills, but the data tools include critical thinking skills. Schraw and Dennission's scale includes 52 items. What made the authors adopt just 17? Are you assessing MC knowledge? Which MC skills scale did you use?</p> <p>Data Analysis: the authors should put which statistical procedures were employed on which platform.</p> <p>Findings: Findings section should pertain to just this study's results. Support section should go either to literature or discussion section</p> <p>You basically assessed MC knowledge and cannot call it skills.</p> <p>This paper misses a discussion section. They already presented findings and there is another part of summary of findings- what the reader needs is a discussion.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Yes</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nesrin Ozturk</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Izmir Democracy University, Turkey</b>