

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 <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.	This manuscript is very interesting in terms of its topic about "Little Teacher" practice in the school, wondering if it is also practiced in other schools in the country. Although pedagogically speaking, it is under critical questions, such a practice would enhance a transfer of knowledge among peer students and learning takes place without teacher's unnecessarily repeated remarks which are not favourable among low achiever students. This manuscript has proven how such a teaching "method" is successful in so doing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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 of the article is comprehensive containing what should be written to include purposes of the study, research methodology, and results. There should be coherence in using the p value of the statistical analysis which is 0.00 in the abstract and 0.05 in the results. Such different values demonstrate significantly the confidence level of the researcher on the results of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are.	
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.	In general, this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound in terms that there have been efforts to prove what is stated in the topic. There are improvements in the students' achievement before and after the treatment. However, it should be stated in the methods section about the type of experimental research: whether it is one-shot case study or static group comparison (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Mentioning such a type of experimental research has its consequences in how data are collected and analyzed which in the manuscript should be further elaborated. In turn, this adds more robustness in the manuscript itself.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are sufficient and recent. My suggestion is to add more references in research methodology.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English language quality is suitable for scholarly communication. My suggestion is to replace the phrase "It's Effectiveness" to "Its Effectiveness" in the topic.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hazairin Eko Prasetyo
Department, University & Country	Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa, Indonesia