

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_123471
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Stereotypes Threat Exposure Condition on Episodic Memory in University Students
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>While the manuscript addresses a relevant issue, it fails to make a significant contribution to the scientific community due to its lack of originality and depth. The study reiterates well-known findings on stereotype threat without offering any novel insights or practical implications. The research adds little to the existing body of knowledge, and the narrow focus on university students from specific social categories limits its generalizability. The paper would benefit from a more innovative approach to truly impact the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is not suitable for the content of the manuscript. It is vague and does not accurately convey the study's scope or findings. A more specific and concise title, such as "Minimal Insights on Stereotype Threat's Influence on Episodic Memory Across Social Categories," would be more appropriate.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a solid overview of the study but could benefit from more clarity. It could include brief information on the methods used for statistical analysis and the implications of the findings. Additionally, it would be helpful to explicitly mention the specific number of participants in each group within the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is disjointed and lacks coherence. The transitions between sections are abrupt, making it difficult for the reader to follow the logic of the study. The subsections are not appropriately divided, leading to a lack of clarity in the presentation of methods and results. The discussion section is weak and fails to critically engage with the findings or place them in the broader context of existing research. A complete restructuring is needed to enhance readability and logical flow.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically weak and fails to provide robust evidence to support its claims. The methodology is poorly explained, particularly the procedures used to induce stereotype threat, which undermines the study's credibility. The statistical analysis is superficial and does not adequately address potential confounding variables or limitations. The findings, though statistically significant, are not sufficiently impactful or meaningful to warrant publication in their current form.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are inadequate and outdated. The manuscript relies too heavily on older studies and fails to incorporate recent research that could provide a more comprehensive understanding of stereotype threat and its effects on memory. The lack of engagement with contemporary literature significantly weakens the paper. Additional references from recent high-impact journals should be included to strengthen the theoretical framework and discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Quality: The language is subpar for scholarly communication. Numerous grammatical errors and awkward phrasings detract from the overall readability of the manuscript. A thorough proofreading and revision for clarity and precision are necessary before this paper can be considered for publication. • Additional References: The manuscript would benefit from citing more recent and relevant studies to bolster its arguments and provide a more nuanced discussion of stereotype threat and episodic memory. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In conclusion, this manuscript falls short of the standards expected for publication. Significant revisions are required to improve its scientific rigor, coherence, and overall contribution to the field. Without substantial improvements, the manuscript is unlikely to have any meaningful impact on the scientific community.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Abdullah
Department, University & Country	Khyber Medical College, Pakistan