

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_121741
Title of the Manuscript:	EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF GRADE VI PUPILS IN SAN ROQUE AND PAMBUJAN DISTRICTS NORTHERN SAMARs
Type of the Article	Research paper

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: 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.	This manuscript holds a significant important for the scientific community because it gives a thorough look at how education works in rural schools and how that affects students' grades. It gives teachers and policy-makers useful information for improving the quality of education in similar situations by pointing out the link between extra-curricular activities and student outcomes. The results are strong because they were based on a thorough analysis and descriptive-correlational method. I like how carefully the manuscript looks at different teaching methods, but it would be better with a more thorough literature study and a clearer explanation of its limitations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title looks good.	
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 is comprehensive but needs to improve its clarity and structure so that the abstract will be more structured, clearer, and informative.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure are generally appropriate.	
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 scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodological approach, including the use of a descriptive-correlational design and systematic random sampling, which enhances the reliability and validity of the findings. The comprehensive data collection from multiple rural schools and the detailed statistical analysis, including frequency counts, percentages, mean weighted means, and t-tests, provide a solid basis for the study's conclusions. The clear differentiation between independent and dependent variables and the use of validated research instruments ensure that the study's outcomes are well-supported and credible. The significant findings regarding co-curricular activities' impact on academic performance offer valuable insights for educators and policymakers, contributing to the study's scientific value.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Many of the references appear to be outdated. It is recommended to include more recent references from the past 5-10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments	Proofread and grammarly check is required.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nurshaidah Mohamad Sari
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia