



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_60640
Title of the Manuscript:	OVERLOADED CURRICULUM AND STUDENTS' LEARNING EFFECTIVENESS
Type of the Article	Short Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It may be suggested that a revision of the article text concerning punctuation is conducted (e.g. a dot after second hypothesis in section 1.3).</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In-text references to the texts by 2 authors are usually written with the use of '&amp;' symbol instead of 'and', e.g. (Sulaiman &amp; Akinsanya 2011).</li> <li>2. Some revision of the references list may be also suggested to eliminate some extra dashes and the lack of a dash after a dot (Weiten, W. (2007). Psychology: Themes and variations. Belmont, CA: Thomson).</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, the research is well-structured and includes all the necessary sections such as abstract, keywords, introduction, purpose of the study and statement of the problem, research method, results, conclusion/recommendation. The methodology (both for data collection and analysis) of the research is overall relevant to study's aims. The results are described in a thorough and fulfilling manner. The data represented in the research allows to make the recommendations that the author(-s) came up with.	

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ivan Gretsky
Department, University & Country	HSE University, Russia