

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127900
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Reading Fluency of Seventh Grade Students: An Action Research
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript shows how choral reading can help middle school students improve their reading skills. It adds valuable information to the research on effective teaching methods, especially in reading for young learners. The study demonstrates how choral reading increases student engagement, motivation, and reading ability, which can help teachers in their classrooms. This research provides useful ideas for future studies on improving reading skills in secondary education.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and appropriate for the article. It effectively conveys that the study focuses on improving reading fluency among seventh-grade students	
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 this article provides a good summary of the main parts of the research, including the purpose, methods, results, and conclusions. It gives a clear overview of the study and its findings. Overall, I think it's well done.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically reliable overall.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references appear sufficient to support the main points in the manuscript,	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This article is well-written. It presents the ideas clearly, and the findings are easy to understand. However, there is some inconsistency with the verb tense. It's best to use the past tense when describing the study results and the present tense for general knowledge or the ongoing relevance of the findings. Abstract: "Over a 12-weeks period, 28 students (13 female and 15 male) from class seven participated in the research in a middle school setting." could be better as "Over a 12-week period, 28 students (13 female and 15 male) from a seventh-grade class participated in the research in a middle school setting." "The finding aligns with the structured interview" could be better as "The findings aligned with the structured interview data."	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Suwanee Siripitakchai
Department, University & Country	Pakchong Pittayakom School, Thailand