

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128221
Title of the Manuscript:	Collaborating Glitches Of Students And Classroom Diplomatic Handling Of Teachers In Public Elementary Schools
Type of the Article	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: 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.	Paper entitled "collaborating glitches of students and classroom diplomatic handling of teachers in the classroom in public elementary schools" with reference to its variables, has much significance for teachers, researchers and other individuals related to the field of teaching and learning. As study based upon the relationships of independent and dependent variables, is important for the community. It can be enriched by adding more and latest review materials.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it 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.	Ambiguity regarding the questionnaire(s) should be clarified. Data collection procedure is missing there in the abstract, it should also be given.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct, although few problems were there, but with the improvement (as suggested in it) it would be refined more.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, add more (few) and latest on, if possible.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, suitable.	
Optional/General comments	As a whole it is correct, add justification of the study (at the end of introduction, then add statement of problem, then objectives of the study. Improve as per guidelines given in the paper. Detailed comments and suggestions for improvement have been given in the paper, which should be considered to make better the manuscript.	

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:	Makhdoom Ali Syed
Department, University & Country	University of Kotli, AJ&K, Pakistan