

Review Form2

Book Name:	<a href="#">An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3748
Title of the Manuscript:	The Environment and Operation of Secondary School Units in the North Aegean Region
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is a good one. It addressed the current problems militating against school unitorganisations and the teaching staff.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>The title is modified to read</b> the influence of environment on the operation of secondary units in the North Agean Region.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<b>The abstract is not well written. It did not capture some variables of the study. No conclusion and recommendation</b>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections would have been appropriate but were all muddled up. They were too wordy.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	They are so many technical errors and inappropriate citations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are obsolete. There is need to revisit the reference for update. This is 2024.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English construction does not befit scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The author should revisit the paper and be cautious of what he pens down.</p> <p>OBSERVATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. REVISIT THE TITLE</li><li>2. The abstract is not wellwritten. No conclusion and recommendation.</li><li>3. The introduction isbadlywritten. The variables of the study are not wellexplained. There weretoomany citations on the background.</li><li>4. No muchreview of the literature. Previousauthors have to beproperlyreviewed.</li><li>5. The methodologyisclumsy. It is not wellstated</li><li>6. The reports of the findings are not clearlystated. It istoowordy</li><li>7. The conclusion shouldbesomaarised and addrecommendation</li></ol>	

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:	Senny Oluwatumbi Oso
Department, University & Country	Ekiti State University, Nigeria