



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_23618
Title of the Manuscript:	A cautionary note on measuring the pupil premium attainment gap in England
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/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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It may be helpful to know the descriptive statistics for the groups in table 2. The percentages give a less rigorous interpretation of this data.	Thanks but no action taken. It is not clear what 'descriptive statistics ' means here. There are no appropriate sampling theory techniques (such as t-test or chi-squared) since there is no sample. This is <i>all</i> children at school in England. And an 'effect' size would not be very suitable since these are context figures, underlying the differences (expressed as effect sizes) in Table 3. I think this is clearer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		