

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_82374
Title of the Manuscript:	PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIERS OF VIETNAM HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ONLINE LEARNING DUE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-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	<p>In abstract, you should change your expression "to figure out" for an appropriate verb for an objective. You could use "describe" or "identify barriers" as options. Also, date details are not necessary in this part. You could use this space to explain some details about design and method instead.</p> <p>In first research question you should change "how are" expression. I think you are trying to say, "which are" or "what are the characteristics". I mean if you're trying to identify or describe it.</p> <p>You did a complete, clear, and useful review of literature. I have no comments on this field. I suggest writing a clear and precise objective in page 4 (line highlighted with yellow). Is not very clear if you'll do a literature description or a quantitative analysis of the relationships between variables. Also, isn't clear what means the expression "internal relationships". Is this a concept? Maybe you're talking about a kind of analysis? Later, in "design" is clear you refer to correlation analysis, but you must make it clear in the objective.</p> <p>It is important to explicitly declare sampling. Expressing "convenience sampling" should be enough.</p> <p>Did you run any psychometric analysis? If there isn't, Is there any psychometric data for your main instrument (scale of students' online learning barriers)? You should include some information about it to understand validity and reliability.</p> <p>Did you include some ethic consideration in your study? You should refer to Helsinki's agreement for research on human population.</p> <p>In general, I suggest reviewing theoretical explanations provided in the results section. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should be interesting to deepen into the theoretical explanation of relationships between technical skills and social interaction. I suggest analyzing "How technical issues in online learning can obstruct or facilitate communication and relationships in learning process". And, what about the relationship between social interaction and motivation? There is a large amount of research about it to refer. - In gender differences should be interesting to expand the possible explanations to results. Is there any cultural or educational explanation? Or maybe an evolutionary alternative? Research is controversial in this area. For example, some research had found better female communication abilities when expressing emotion is the focus, and better male communication when assertive abilities are measured. Also, higher motivation and engagement scores are usually reported in the most of research for female. Some explanations of this result area are linked to more maturity and responsibility in woman. I think a more detailed explanation of the results in this area for the special context of your research is needed. - A deeper explanation in the other result's fields would be appreciated. The main idea is to understand how the results can be understood in the especial context of this research. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Did you run analysis to confirm any statistical assumption?</p> <p>Suggestion: Put the correlation and ANOVA results in () and express p value as > or < .01/.05 following APA normative. Ex. (F = 11,725, p <.01). The exception is when p value is equal to an exact value; for example: p=.569.</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> I suggest including a short description about ethical considerations in this study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jorge Ignacio Maluenda Albornoz
Department, University & Country	Universidad San Sebastián, Chile