

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_98989
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Science Teachers' Instructional and Assessment Challenges in the New Normal
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>1 yes 2 yes 3 yes 4 no see below 5 yes 6 yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No idea	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There is a lot of text with repetition. I miss a theoretical section. Many can be found in the results section, but that is not a place to be. The result section has too much text. The research questions need a revision. How is the first rq answering the question about challenges? question 3 is a yes/no question and is not allowed like this. Rewrite! 4 is not a rq but can be used to answer the questions. readiness of HEIs don't shorten this the first time. I see it in 1.1 that's late. Abstract: No abbreviations Mention the Philippines. 2.2 mention the Philippines car 2.4 other kind of references 3.1.1. table 1 is far away Is Table 2 mentioned in the text? The descriptive rating Table 2 is not mentioned in the method section. When is it Agree? Same table 3 Same table 4 etc The reference list needs attention.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Dierdorp
Department, University & Country	Utrecht University, Netherlands