

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_123890
Title of the Manuscript:	Demystifying the assumptions of the need and efficacy of trail examinations: Students' and teachers' perspectives, and the statistical relationships between examination scores
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[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>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it fills a crucial gap in the literature regarding the efficacy of trial examinations (TE) in the Bhutanese educational context. By rigorously evaluating both qualitative and quantitative aspects of TE, the study provides empirical evidence on its impact on student achievement and teacher perspectives. The use of robust statistical analysis to test assumptions about TE's benefits and drawbacks offers valuable insights into its actual effectiveness, challenging common misconceptions about its potential drawbacks. These findings can inform educational policies and practices not only in Bhutan but also in similar educational settings, contributing to more evidence-based approaches in educational assessment and reform.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is largely suitable but could be refined for clarity and impact. Here's a breakdown of its strengths and potential improvements:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Relevance: The title clearly indicates that the article addresses the need and efficacy of trial examinations (TE), which aligns with the article's focus. Scope: It suggests that the study includes both qualitative perspectives from students and teachers and quantitative analysis of examination scores. <p>Potential Improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity on "Trail": There appears to be a typo in the word "trail," which should be "trial." Correcting this would enhance clarity and professionalism. Focus on "Statistical Relationships": The mention of "statistical relationships between examination scores" might be more specific. Consider specifying that it relates to the correlation between TE and board examination scores for added precision. Brevity and Precision: The title could be slightly shortened to make it more concise. For example, the phrase "and the statistical relationships between examination scores" could be condensed to focus more directly on the key aspects of the research. <p>Revised Title Suggestion:</p> <p>"Demystifying the Need and Efficacy of Trial Examinations: Perspectives of Students and Teachers and Their Statistical Relationships with Examination Scores"</p> <p>This revised title maintains the core elements while improving clarity and conciseness.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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 of the article is generally comprehensive but could be enhanced with a few additional details. It provides a clear overview of the background, methods, and key findings, but here's a more detailed breakdown:</p> <p>Context and Purpose: The abstract effectively introduces the context and purpose of the study—examining the need and efficacy of trial examinations (TE) in Bhutanese education. It mentions the educational strategic document that prompted the review, which is useful for understanding the motivation behind the research.</p> <p>Methods: It describes the qualitative inquiry initially conducted and the subsequent quantitative analysis. The number of participants (261 teachers and 562 students) and the amount of data collected (academic results of 2432 class 10 and 557 class 12 students) are mentioned, which provides a sense of the study's scale.</p> <p>Results: The abstract summarizes the main findings, including teachers' views on TE, the perceived benefits for student achievement, and the statistical significance of the correlations between TE and board examination marks.</p> <p>Conclusions: It notes that some common perceptions about TE, such as waste of instructional time and stress, were found to be myths.</p> <p>However, the abstract could be improved by including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Objectives: Explicitly stating the main research objectives or hypotheses would clarify the focus of the study. • Significance of Findings: Briefly mentioning the implications of the findings for educational policy or practice would add depth. • Limitations: A brief mention of any limitations of the study could provide a more balanced view. <p>Overall, the abstract is effective but could benefit from these additional details to enhance its completeness and impact.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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 robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it addresses a significant gap in the literature by investigating the need and efficacy of trial examinations (TE) in the Bhutanese educational context, which had previously been underexplored. Secondly, the study employs a comprehensive mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews and focus groups with quantitative analysis of academic achievement data from a substantial sample of teachers and students. This methodological rigor allows for a well-rounded examination of the research questions. Finally, the use of both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze data ensures that the findings are statistically reliable, with significant correlations reported between TE and board examination results, thus validating the perceived benefits and addressing misconceptions about TE's impact.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, it is more than enough.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is apt.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Ekramul Hassan
Department, University & Country	Jazan University, KSA