Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJESS_85111**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Exploring the Relationship between Students' Attitude towards Mathematics and their Achievement in Mathematics**
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:

(https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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	**Restructure Question 3 and 4** Are you finding the relationship between students' ATM and Achievement using the correlation analysis? If this be the case, your question should spell it out as "Relationship" not "Correlation". Thus, you may have to restructure the question. Here is one suggestion: What is the relationship between grade six students' ATM and achievements in mathematics? Moreover, the title of your study reads as "RELATIONSHIP" Q. 4 What is the correlation between students' ATM and level of students' achievement in Mathematics? **The question may be changed as "What is the relationship between students' ATM and level of students' achievement in Mathematics?"** The study concludes abruptly without providing recommendations. Recommendations are considered the most important part of the analysis phase—this is where researchers suggest interventions or strategies to address the issues and constraints identified in the problem statement of the study based on the key findings arrived at through data collection and analysis.	
Minor REVISION comments	The researchers need to restructure the findings under abstract section to convey the results (and recommendations, if any) clearly and concisely. There is the mixture of British and American English in the manuscript. The researchers need to decide on choosing and using one consistently. Prepare tables as per the Manuscript guidelines. Some tables are in APA format while many are not. References are not prepared as per the Manuscript guidelines.	
Optional/General comments	The reviewer has made some corrections related to grammar and structure. Track-changes are made for researchers' references. The reviewer has restructured result presentations by removing research questions and replacing them with reporting statements. The researchers may go through them to accept or change to (avoid redundancies and) maintain fluidity and clarity in reporting results.	

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:	**Phub Dorji**
Department, University & Country	**Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, Bhutan**