ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 22/08/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF CLASS REPETITION AND MASS PROMOTION ON STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN ANAMBRA STATE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0815/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) *The title refers to the comparative study of impact. In principle, statistical analysis is used to analyze impact (or effect, influence) through regression analysis. Unfortunately, this is not the case in this study. In view of the analyzes carried out, the title should simply be limited to the comparison of the academic achievement of class repetition and mass promotion.*	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) The abstract clearly presents the purpose of the study, the methodology adopted, the results and even the recommendations.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(a brief explanation is recommendable) The text is very well done on the grammatical and orthographic level. Just an error on page 6 in the following sentence where are old and is old should not be repeated simultaneously : "Much of the	

extant literature on the effect of class repetition and automatic promotion on students' academic achievement *are old* (Glaziano,1986; Kenn,1988, Kenny,1989 and Karweit andWasik,1992) *is old* and as at the time of this study there was no information on the impact of mass promotion or class repetition on students' academic achievement in Anambra State, Nigeria."

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

In any case, the methods used are clearly described, even if, as indicated above, there is no match between methods of analysis and the title of the text. The reason given for not studying the reliability of the test is not sufficient. The author will not lose anything by studying this reliability. Finally I do not understand the researcher's approach by studying separately the correlation between the scores of JSS1 and JSS2 for repeaters and mass promoted students. This approach is inadequate to identify the comparative impact.

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

There is an error in the comment of Table 1. In the last sentence of this comment the author writes "However, the repeated group all failed JSS1 in Ambara State". According to the table it is rather mass promoted group who all failed. Another error in the comment of Table 3: The author writes "The analysis in Table 3 examines the degree of correlation among the variables in this study: class repetition and academic achievement." Table 3 does not examine the correlation between class repetition and academic achievement, but between scores of repeated students in JSS1 and JSS2.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

The main conclusion is the impact of grade repetition on student achievement. But as already indicated, the methodology at the level of the data analysis does not make it possible to draw such a conclusion

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**

(a brief explanation is recommendable)
Nothing to report

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	**x**
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- As indicated above, the study of the impact should be done through the analysis of the regression.
- To do this, we would not separate the two groups: the independent variable would then be the repetition or not of class and the dependent variable JSS2

- If such an analysis is not possible, then change the title and limit it to the comparison of the academic achievement of the repeated students and not mass promoted students.
- In any case, the separate study of the correlation between JSS1 and JSS2 is not an adequate approach to determine the impact of class repetition and mass promotion.
- Do not carry out the analyzes manually but use a software.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: