

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_85314</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FACTORS AFFECTING ENGLISH PERFORMANCE OF CLASS IV STUDENTS IN KAZHI AND KHOTOKHA PRIMARY SCHOOL,WANGDUE PHODRANG DZONGKHAG.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>A case study</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The present study is interesting, original but there still should be some suggestions to the author to increase its scientific value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The paper is well written within 6000 words.</li> <li>- <b>FACTORS AFFECTING ENGLISH PERFORMANCE OF CLASS IV STUDENTS IN KAZHI AND KHOTOKHA PRIMARY SCHOOL,WANGDUE PHODRANG DZONGKHAG IN BHUTAN.</b></li> <li>- <b>Abstract:</b></li> <li>- <b>Introduction:</b> Very lengthy, problem statement and the context could have discussed in the introduction briefly. No need to describe much about researchers' background in this case study. Context &amp; about researchers and participants are repeatedly mentioned across the paper. Not required.</li> <li>- And co-author's work is not that much evident from this paper (I mentioned in paper.....where is we two? And do not give generalized opinion in the literature review.</li> <li>- <b>Literature Review:</b> Very less quotes of Bhutanese researchers/Bhutanese context, most of the quotes are old (1994-2007), need to use the latest one (2019-2022).</li> <li>- <b>Methodology:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Under methodology, researchers could have briefly describe all the methodology, tools, data analysis ways and its characteristic together.</li> <li>o Detail description about setting in more than one sections "reduentance". Setting can be written either in introduction or in methodology heading.</li> <li>o Informants: way of selection, characteristics, number, inclusion or exclusion criteria if present.</li> <li>o Statistical analysis for qualitative research like marks in CA, written would have been additional point.</li> <li>o Ethical consideration???</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Findings/Results:</b> need to be more clear, concise and on point. More details and repeated more and more. The results are too long and contain unnecessary materials.</li> <li>- <b>Discussion/Recommendation:</b> The purpose of the discussion is to interpret and describe the significance of your findings in light of what was already known about the research problem being investigated, and to explain any new understanding or fresh insights about the problem after you've taken the findings into consideration. The discussion will always connect to the introduction by way of the research questions or hypotheses you posed and the literature you reviewed, but it does not simply repeat or rearrange the introduction; the discussion should always explain how your study has moved the reader's understanding of the research problem forward from where you left them at the end of the introduction.</li> <li>- <b>Reference:</b> Add most recent reference from 1994-to 2010; majority of reference very old more than 20 years??? Follow the APA properly.</li> <li>- <b>Appendix:</b> All the interview questions asked are not required in this manuscript. It can be deleted. That will just make our paper bulky.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The purpose of the study needs to be clearly stated and should be consistent in all sections.</li> <li>- Provide precise conclusion and recommendations based on your findings</li> <li>- Poof reading is recommended.</li> <li>- <b>Conclusion need to finalize your results.</b> The conclusions are not consistent with the evidence and arguments presented.</li> </ul>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	After taking into account and accepting the proposed corrections, I suggest that the paper should be published, since the analysed issues are quite interesting.	
---------------------------	--	--

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:	Som Bdr. Mongar
Department, University & Country	Nagor Middle Secondary School, Bhutan