



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_50602
Title of the Manuscript:	FEATURES OF FORMATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS' SOCIAL ACTIVITY
Type of the Article	Review Article

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	<p>A very important topic, but the article needs improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. an abstract - It is too long 2. The purpose of the article is to substantiate the theoretical and methodological foundations for the formation of social activity of primary school students in institutions of general secondary education. PLEASE MAKE IT CLEARER, what it means?? - the name is specific for you but not for all audience. Please shortly describe of your educational system. 3. The schemata of an article – first previous research and concepts than material and method. 4. The article should be rethinking. Please start by improving the article schemata and the aim. If I properly understood, it is a description of a special program – in methodological meaning - an experiment or social intervention. The methods and way of doing the program ought to be more detailed describe (what was at the beginning, how long it took place? what did you observe? what tools were used? what was controlled? the variables?). and it is the questions about results - why something is important did you do any statistics? what were the criteria of importance or connections?) and discussion and conclusions - please add more deeply comparisons (with other programs or actions) and summarising. 	<p>We have made the correction according to the comments</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Revision done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Revision made</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[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>	