

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_76465
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing the Quality of Academic Performance in Higher and Middle Secondary Schools of Trashy Yangtse Dzongkhag.
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In my opinion, the study is very interesting and worth being published. In fact, the article is well-structured, the method used is congruent with the purpose of the study and the results are presented clearly. Nevertheless, the sections are not sufficiently developed to exhibit the value of the research undertaken by the authors. For this reason, I feel I can give the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background – Expand a little more to highlight the research problem to highlight the study's need. 2. Methodology - expand a little more. Add analysis methods. 3. Contribution: It would be a good paper if it did look at the research impact on the community. Expand a little more. 4. Findings: Should align with the study goal. In fact, the Discussion and Conclusion sections are not sufficiently developed. See below the following suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First of all, I suggest to include one short paragraph summarizing the purpose of the study and the main findings obtained. - Second, I think that the whole discussion needs to be re-structured to include: theoretical implications of the study, practical implications, limitations and future studies and a brief conclusion. 5. Recommendations: Expand a little more. 6. Recommendation for Researchers 7. Figures and tables must be in line with scientific norms and standards 8. Please, include more citations about 2020 and 2021 and presented according to reference' style, norms and standards. For example, this references could be included: <p>Pozo-Rico, T., Gilar-Corbí, R., Izquierdo, A., & Castejón, J. L. (2020). Teacher Training Can Make a Difference: Tools to Overcome the Impact of COVID-19 on Primary Schools. An Experimental Study. <i>International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health</i>, 17(22), 8633.</p> <p>Brink, H. W., Loomans, M. G., Mobach, M. P., & Kort, H. S. (2021). Classrooms' indoor environmental conditions affecting the academic achievement of students and teachers in higher education: A systematic literature review. <i>Indoor air</i>, 31(2), 405-425.</p> <p>Gilar-Corbi, R., Pozo-Rico, T., Castejón, J. L., Sánchez, T., Sandoval, I., & Vidal, J. (2020). Academic Achievement and Failure in University Studies: Motivational and Emotional Factors. <i>Sustainability</i>, 12(23), 9798.</p> <p>I think the authors can easily follow the suggestions I have given in this review and make a new version of their interesting paper.</p> <p>All best wishes.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Teresa Pozo-Rico</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Alicante, Spain</i>