

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_97816
Title of the Manuscript:	A survey of teachers' perceptions of the use of alternative assessment strategies in the virtual classroom
Type of the Article	Empirical; the article seems more qualitative than quantitative in nature. However, the research would be better as a mixed methods.

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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Important Teachers' Perception of Alternative Assessment Utilization in Virtual Classroom in Trinidad and Tobago (However, the locale need not to cover the whole country) Not precise and comprehensive to cover the necessary aspects of the research. Not really. The Introduction should encompass the background to the study, the conceptual, theoretical and the Empirical reviews. To be followed by the Statement to the Problem; The Objectives of the Study, The Research Questions or and Hypotheses before the Methodology which precede the Results, then Discussion separated from the Conclusion and lastly the Recommendations before the References.. Not really; the procedure for data collection and method of data analysis were conspicuously missing, so, not scientific enough. The references should correctly follow the latest APA format. Additional suggestions are already commented on the reviewed article. The introductory aspect of the paper is too lengthy; curtail it to maximum of seven pages. There are unnecessary statements in the methodology which should be deleted.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good.	
Optional/General comments	The paper will be more scientific, highly novel and publishable if the comments are stringently adhered to. Reduce the pages to maximum of 20.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abiodun Ezekiel Adesina
Department, University & Country	Emmanuel Alayande College of Education, Nigeria