

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_87140
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the interrelation between time management and academic achievement among university students
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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>The paper is flawed in many ways and I have inserted my comments into the document.</p> <p>Abstract: reports irrelevant detail Introduction: fails to discuss the literature in an adequate manner, fails to present literature on the gender aspect which is an important part of the analysis, embed your research in a theoretical framework</p> <p>Method: little information about the sample, not psychometric information about the data collection</p> <p>Results: Data presented as copy and paste from the SPSS output files; extract the relevant information</p> <p>Provide a rationale for the analyses that are run</p> <p>Discussion: Use the literature as a reference for interpreting the results, discuss the limitations of the study</p> <p>Use the style sheet consistently</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The ethical issue that I can detect is that the study does not use a rigorous method nor has it been developed against a valid theoretical background</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Margarete Imhof
Department, University & Country	Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany