

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JESBS_84863 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impact Analysis of Education in Emergency in Wangduechoeling LSS |
| Type of the Article | Case study |

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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarify what you were doing: Were you analysing the survey questions developed and circulated by the government (You claim so under methodology), or implementing the survey tool as directed by government?The whole background section has no single reference/citation, hence, passes as mere claims. You do not even state if it is anecdotal.Consider objective 6. Just how were you going to achieve it? It looks misplaced.Question 18 (Students' questionnaire) is unclear. Were the students the one to avail (sic) discount data service? Rephrase the item.The tense of the report; it looks like a proposal (see the first sentence, paragraph 1 under methodology, for example).Provide a statement on ethical considerations during you interviewing process.Define 'Education in Emergencies'. Seemingly, you have equated the latter to alternative means of educating during an emergency such as COVID-19 pandemic.Provide reference for the Bucketing approach (section 4.3).Your list of references is extremely short. This denies you study the authority and credibility required in academia. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">I used the survey questionnaires developed by Ministry of Education, Royal Government of Bhutan. However, based on this survey questionnaires, I did case of my school WLSS. It is a self-funded research project. Yes, the methodology I adopted for this research is survey and interview.CLT: conceptual framework explainedBackgroundYes, students were the ones who availed discount data service. Sentence was rephrased as highlighted in the revised paper.I made all tenses of paper (methodology and discussion) into past tense.Ethical considerations - reflectedEiEBucketing approachAdded six of in-text and end-text citations. |
| Minor REVISION comments | Get a language expert to edit the manuscript. It has issues of typos and grammar, the latter rendering some sections vague. See Line 5 of 1.1 (first part), and sentence 1 of Literature Review, for example. Explain why you preferred descriptive design to the inferential one as you stated. | Edited |
| Optional/General comments | The findings have more implications than you provided. You may want to revisit the data collected and draw more insights. For example, you found out that 90% of children enjoyed virtual learning (though they spent little time on it – 1-2 hrs per day). But again, there is poor network connectivity. How is the enjoyment part possible given the lack of good network? | Revisited |

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> | Yes, I have lighted ethical issues under ethical consideration after methodology part. |