

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGRESS_12523
Title of the Manuscript:	The Family Response and Impact of the "Double Reduction" Education Reform in Chinese Compulsory Education
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject matter is relevant 2. It is quite instructive 3. It is an addition to knowledge. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but may need to be reduced to meet the requirement of the journal.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although the topic is relevant, it has fallen short of the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requisite referencing style, • numbering and • appropriate heading for methodology 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form	They are sufficient and about 30% recent	

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some of the sentences are too long and wordy. Some sentence are dangling, characterised by long phrases and punctuations.	
Optional/General comments	There is the need to rephrase some of these sentences to make them more vivid and coherent. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Balica Braimah
Department, University & Country	Tamale Technical University, Ghana