

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_79468
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Achievement Scores of Students in Economics Exposed to Three Objective Test Formats
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The results of tests of between-subject effects in Table 3 is given lacking. The value of gender should be given, too. Also, the value of dependent variable should be given in Table 3. In the table, the item formats are interpreted, but it is not true. The value of Item formats*Gender should be interpreted.</p> <p>In Table 4, the results of pairwise-comparisons is shown with the sign (*). This means is that the mean difference is significant at the .05 level, but it is interpreted as &lt;.001 in sig b.</p> <p>Because there is the value of the intercept in Table 5, it could understand that the tests of between-subject effects was interpreted. But the table would not be interpreted if the value of tests of within-subjects effects is not given, here.</p> <p>The factor analysis of the scale should be done and given in the text.</p> <p>While it is interpreted at the discussion and findings, it should be given a short knowledge about research results of Eleje et al. (2020), too.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The Sd values should be given inTable 2, too.</p> <p>While it is interpreted the Table 5, it is written as Table 4 in the text.</p> <p>There is an author at the references that is not indicated in the text (Margit&amp;Barbara, 2010).</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dursun Eğriboyun</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Defence University, Turkey</b>