

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_77339
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Civic Literacy in Elementary Social Studies amidst the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The following terms require clarification and explanation either in the introduction or in the methodology <ol style="list-style-type: none"> C3 Framework and Inquiry approach Emergency Curriculum In the methodology, it is mentioned about an FGD with teachers but no clarity related with sample size and sample site What is the rationale of using Grade 4 SS curriculum for analysis? It is mentioned that the study has adopted a content analysis on the learning packets, self-learning modules, and the Most Essential Learning Outcomes but in the analysis part only the self -learning modules have been analysed. What about the analysis of others? In the analysis, it is mentioned about the use of Formative Assessment. But no further analysis related with how it has been used by the teachers during this pandemic. Similar is the case with Pre-test (Diagnostic) and Post-test (Summative). It is essential to provide few examples for the analysed content to support your arguments. It is also mentioned about the FGD but the data from FGD has not been seen in the analysis part. Analysis part require thorough modification by incorporating data and illustration from Content analysis and FGD. There are few references which are incomplete. Curry, K., & Smith, D. (2017). Assessment practices in social studies classrooms: Results from a longitudinal survey. <i>Social Studies Research and Practice</i> (No volume, issue number, page number) Drake, F. D., & Nelson, L. R. (2009). <i>Engagement in teaching history: Theory and practices for middle and secondary teachers</i>. Pearson College Division (Publisher is different, Year differ from the text) Bayram, T. A. Y. Alternative Assessment Methods in Social Studies (No year, publisher etc) Boulègue, M., Lutsevych, O., & Marin, A. (2018). Civil Society Under Russia's Threat: Building Resilience in Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova. <i>URL: https://www. chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/research/2018-11-08-civil-society-russia-threat-ukraine-belarus-moldova-boulegue-lutsevych-marin. Pdf</i> (Not in the text. May be related with UNDP in the text, then needs to be modified in the text) 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is the difference between MELCs and Learning Competencies? It is abbreviated that Most Essential Learning Outcomes as MELCs. Is it MELCs or MELOs? Are outcomes are same as Competencies? In the analysis part only learning competencies have been mentioned but in the methodology part it is mentioned as MELCs. This creates confusion What is SLM ? Is it Self-Learning Modules, then please provide the abbreviation in the first instant itself 	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The paper is relevant and meaningful but lacks methodological rigour. Analysis part is poor and require modification.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vijayan K</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>India</i>