

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_122031
Title of the Manuscript:	'Little Teacher' in the Remedial Class: It's Effectiveness in Learning of Low-achiever Students of Class IX Chemistry and Integrated Science of Class VII & VIII
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article addresses an important topic in educational research, focusing on the effectiveness of peer-assisted learning in remedial classes. The study's findings contribute significantly to strategies for improving the performance of low-achieving students. However, there are some areas that require revision to enhance the manuscript's overall quality and scientific rigor.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is mostly suitable, but it could be more concise. Consider simplifying it to "Effectiveness of Peer-Assisted Learning in Remedial Classes for Low-Achieving Students in Chemistry and Integrated Science."	
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.	The abstract comprehensively provides overview of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, but the flow between sections could be improved. The introduction discusses the importance of remedial education but does not explicitly state what gap this study aims to fill.	
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.	The manuscript is generally scientifically sound, but the methodology section lacks clarity. For example, the sampling process is not clearly explained, how were the "low-achieving" students identified and what was the criteria for considering student as "low achiever"? The statistical analysis should be more rigorous, with clear justification for the methods used.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate but could be more current. Several references are over a decade old. It would strengthen the manuscript to include more recent studies (from the last five years).	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear, but there are some grammatical errors and difficult phrasings. For example, in the introduction, "The role of a little teacher is playing an important part" should be revised to "The role of the 'Little Teacher' plays a significant part."	
Optional/General comments	The study addresses a relevant issue in education, and the concept of using peer-assisted learning in remedial classes is valuable. With the recommended revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to the field.	

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:	Gulab Ali
Department, University & Country	Government Associate College, Pakistan