

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	A survey

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)	1. Yes, it is suitable especially if it is to be implemented in the researcher's community 2. The title is okay 3. The abstract is acceptable 4. The researcher needs to check the format of the journal that he/she would like to publish especially the in-text citations and references.....From what I have observed, the format is different from what the author adopted here in his/her writing. 5. Yes 6. Some references need to be added to complement the 'old' research done. For instance, on definitions of terms like 'what is a population,' 'what is an alternative assessment', 'what is competency'... The author can get a lot of current definitions given (the latest 5 years).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is acceptable (good)	
Optional/General comments	The figure on "teacher competencies for alternative assessments"....is the information adopted, adapted or researcher's own ideas?? There is no source stated.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Surina Nayan
Department, University & Country	UiTM, Malaysia