

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_123827
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Scaffolding Teaching Strategy on the Achievement and Retention of Lower Basic 5 Special Needs Pupils' in Special Needs Schools in Abia State, Nigeria
Type of the 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>
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.	Since the study was conducted with special needs people, it is highly appreciated. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. The discussion part is commendable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title may be spelled out instead of the numeral 5. Also, the word 'Special Needs' was used two times. It may be rewritten as "The Effect of Scaffolding Teaching Strategy on the Achievement and Retention of Lower Basic Five Pupils' in Special Needs Schools in Abia State, Nigeria. "	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract has to be modified • The 4th line may be rewritten as 'the sample consisted of 37 lower basic five primary school students' • What is the need to mention tool validation experts in the abstract? • The objectives of the study should be mentioned in the abstract • The abstract may conclude with the study's findings—no need to mention recommendations in the abstract 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some subsections, like a review of related works and the Tools used for the study, may be given.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the statement of the problem, the problem has to be stated elaborately • The research gap is not mentioned. It has to be added • In research questions, the term 'Primary five' has been used. In other places, 'Lower basic five' is used. A similar term has to be used throughout the article • In the research instrument, HEAT, the tool may be well explained in terms of a number of statements and dimensions • The scaffolding teaching strategies used should be detailed. Also, how the scaffolding teaching strategy is operationalised in this study is not mentioned • Describe how the experiment was carried out • The research terms are not defined • What is the duration between the achievement and delayed achievement tests? • What is the Sample size, 37 or 40? The methodology mentions 37, but the analysis table revealed 40. Justify it • The Results and Discussions interpretation for Table 1 mentions that the LM score is 0.05, but in the table, it is mentioned as 0.10 • Interpretations for the table 2 and Table 4 are not correct. Since the null hypothesis is rejected, it reveals a significant difference. Also, for Table 6, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it shows there was no significant difference • In Research Question 2, the third line mentions research question 3. Also, in Hypothesis 2, the second paragraph mentions 'the data for testing hypothesis 5' • In Table 6, the p-value is 0.787. However, in the interpretation, the p-value is mentioned as 0.002. • Has the study measured interest? In the 2nd line, the recommendations are stated as 'special pupils' interest'. What is the need for mentioning it? 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recommendations 1 and 2 are the same	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some of The references are missing. For example, Van (2010), Thomas (2013), Umoren in Nwadike (2019).	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical errors are present. For example, Research questions 1 and 2, 'What are the differences?' must be written. A complete check is required.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the 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?	<u>No</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sahaya Mary T
Department, University & Country	Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, India