

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_90109
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDENTS' MOTIVATION AND PERCEPTION IN LEARNING SOCIAL SCIENCE USING DISTANCE LEARNING MODALITY DURING COVID 19- PANDEMIC
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>)

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>The study as titled presented an adequate abstract that was broken into aims, study design, results and conclusion. It summarised the contents of the body in a manner that encourages further reading of the subsequent headings.</p> <p>The author is encouraged to do more work on the submission before final publication via the use of applications that help with spell check, conciseness, clarity etc. Outside few observations of areas that must be corrected because of slips relating to grammar, the author is commended for using a good level of academic language with minimal slips in the aforementioned areas of concern.</p> <p>An example of a required subtle correction is in line 39 where there is a need to remove the apostrophe used on students. This has been highlighted for quick spotting in the attached manuscript. Others can also be detected and corrected with a good grammar correction software.</p> <p>The paper is empirical research just as reflected in the conducted study. It relied on a good theoretical background featuring a well cited work of Deci & Ryan on self-determination, also known as SDT.</p> <p>Author reported to have followed the quantitative approach using descriptive comparative approach. It is a good piece of report that can make use of a few or minor corrections in grammar. However, an area of concern also lies in the observation that the author did not mention the name or technique used to determine the validity and reliability of questionnaires that was administered to the respondents. See highlighted lines 93-95 of the manuscript.</p> <p>Also, a minimal data analysis was reported. This could have been more reported to foster reproducibility. Author is advised to revise the sentence in line 114 as "learning social science cannot perceive". A preferable word should be used to take care of the intended expression.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>All other aspects of the study were seen to be adequate. The references were properly cited in the text as well as in the bibliography.</p> <p>The submission is free of plagiarism and represents author's personal work.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>According to my opinion after taking time to review this submission, I can say that it successfully passed the threshold prerequisite to the approval of publishing an academic paper.</p>	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aderogba Adewusi
Department, University & Country	National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria