



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_64854
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Sindh Education Foundation (SEF) and Private Educational Institutions: A case study of District Khairpur
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/journal/10/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	The research has theoretical relevance and deals with a very pertinent theme for education not only in Pakistan but around the world, especially when we reflect on many of the social inequalities that occur due to educational differences and the lack of public policies that minimize this situation. Nevertheless, the main weakness of the research is the lack of a methodology to support the results presented. After topic 2. (literature review), no other study is mentioned, indicating the assertions presented, nor describing the way in which the studies in question were searched in the scientific literature. It is not clear the methodology that supports the results provided. It should also be noted that the study does not present its limitations and possibilities for future research, which is important for advances on the theme. The research presented is not recent, not even in the introduction, when citing the current situation of the country in terms of education. Thus, it is suggested that the study methodology be described, as well as its limitations and future research possibilities, with the inclusion of other more current materials.	
Minor REVISION comments	There is not.	
Optional/General comments	There is not.	



SDI 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amanda Lays Monteiro Inácio
Department, University & Country	Universidade São Francisco, Brasil