

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 Wangduechhoeling 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>)

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.	
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.	
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?	

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:	Wycliffe Osabwa
Department, University & Country	Alupe University College, Kenya