

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_91207
Title of the Manuscript:	Teaching seasons with a hands-on activity
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journaliaarij.com/index.php/IAARJ/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	<p><b>The topic is interesting, yet the paper lacks the scientific research methodology:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A thorough editing is highly recommended. Many language problems and misuse of conjunctions are there all over the paper.</li> <li>2. The abstract needs to be re-written where attention is paid to include: the aim of the study, the research question, the study sample, the significance, the model applied and some conclusions and recommendations.</li> <li>3. There is no full stop at the end of the keywords which should not be written italics.</li> <li>4. Reading the whole paper, there is no scientific research methodology at all.</li> <li>5. The whole paper is a survey in geography.</li> <li>6. There is no research problem or gap.</li> <li>7. There is no related literature review.</li> <li>8. There are no previous studies.</li> <li>9. No introduction to the topic related to the field language teaching.</li> <li>10. No section of Methodology where the researcher states: the research design, the research instrument, data collection and selection, then data analysis.</li> <li>11. No section of data analysis is provided.</li> <li>12. No experiment is done.</li> <li>13. No proper procedures.</li> <li>14. No results are discussed.</li> <li>15. No section relating this study to other studies in this regard.</li> <li>16. The conclusion is weak.</li> <li>17. References are poorly written: they should be entered in hanging style; that is, the first line of the entry should be left-justified, with the following lines indented five spaces. Italicize book titles, journal titles, and volume numbers. Write the complete information about each reference.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nawal Fadhil Abbas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Baghdad, Iraq</b>