

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_84267
Title of the Manuscript:	Saving and Spending Attitudes of College 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.6

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>I have gone through the manuscript and noted some critical areas where modifications should be done before being published in your reputed journal. The major corrections are mentioned below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The author has not mentioned the research objectives or questions.</li><li>2. It seems like the researcher has confusion between the research objectives and research problems. He /she embedded some areas that should be addressed in research questions than a research problem.</li><li>3. The statement of the problem is too narrow. It fails to emphasize the gravity of the research.</li><li>4. No literature review.</li><li>5. In the result and discussion section, the author has used the hypothesis. However, he/she has failed to mention it in the methodology. e.g:- "Since the computed <math>f=10.01</math> is greater than 1.83 the null hypothesis can be rejected".</li><li>6. The researcher has used both inferential statistics and Anova. But in the study design, he/she has only mentioned the descriptive statistics.</li><li>7. The flow of the result and discussion need to be adjusted with subheadings to grab the reader's attention.</li><li>8. No references were given to the previous research in the findings.</li><li>9. The author should avoid the excessive use of words. e.g:-in the conclusion section, he/she has repetitively used the word "This implies/implies".</li><li>10. Several English language errors are observed across the paragraphs and should be corrected before publication.</li></ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The work here proposed is an interesting topic. The title is suitable and attractive and the abstract is sufficient.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P.P.G. Thyagi Pushpika
Department, University & Country	Advanced Technological Institute-Tangalle, Sri Lanka