



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_49138
Title of the Manuscript:	Grit In Online Education
Type of the Article	Grit In Online Education

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A very interesting paper. 2. There are some comments and queries: 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? 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. 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? 	
Minor REVISION comments	no	
Optional/General comments	no	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthony Wong
Department, University & Country	Caritas Institute of Higher Education, Hong Kong