

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_116574
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING FACTORY MODEL TO ENHANCE CREATIVITY OF STUDENTS IN THE HOME ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT OF THE FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNM
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  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Overall, yes, the concept is good for the scientific community. But it requires refinement and clarity  The topic is good but I would like to suggest another topic "Development of 6M teaching factory model for enhancing creativity in students"  Yes  Yes  Yes  No idea, as the references lack year of publication, have give suggestive method of writing references	OKAY  REVISED    NOTED  OKAY
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Average	THANKS
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	More clarity required. There is no continuation and the flow is lacking. Explanation of Fig 1 lacks due information. The figure is not self-explanatory. I found it quiet general	NOTED

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	