



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_49138</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Grit In Online Education</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Grit In Online Education</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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A very interesting paper.</li> <li>2. There are some comments and queries:</li> <li>3. In the Abstract, it mentioned the p value greater than 0.05 is significant which is also mentioned in Table 11. Is it true? Usually p value less than 0.05 is significant. May the authors clarify this?</li> <li>4. It is better to format the paper in a more professional academic format. For example, the review of literatures is under Introduction; the writing of methodology is not professional as the development of hypotheses H1 and H2 should not be under methodology. The authors are recommended to benchmark the published paper in this Journal about the format of research. Usually they are Abstract, Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results and Analysis, Discussion, and Conclusion. Please format your manuscript accordingly.</li> <li>5. As mentioned in Table 10 that the respondents who filled the 12 Grid items, their performance of courses were compared with their responses. Is it meaning that the responses were not anonymous? If not, is there any ethical issues raised from filling the responses that the researchers knew who filled the questionnaires? In addition, is there any possibility of bias of results?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment 1 required no change</li> <li>2. Comment 2 required no change</li> <li>3. This was an error that has been addressed and the abstract has been modified. It was also corrected in the body where the same incorrect text was used.</li> <li>4. The paper has been reformatted to follow the recommended headings and sections made by the reviewer.</li> <li>5. During phase 1, participants were informed that a subset of students grit scores would be associated with final grades long after the term was completed. All participants consented to be included. After the term ended and the grades were included participants were assigned a number so that they were not identifiable. There is no possibility of bias as by the time the data was analyzed no students were identifiable and all participants had graduated.</li> <li>6. Other changes- the introduction and the literature review were expanded. These changes are noted with yellow highlighting.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	no	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	no	

**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)	