

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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract needs some amendment in that it should reflect the significance and gap in literature.</p> <p>4. The sections are appropriate, though some of them are recommended to merge.</p> <p>5. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7. The following are to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Editing is recommended. - Re-phrase "The study aimed to answer questions related to t..". The aim was mentioned before this phrase. - The word 'respectively' used in the abstract is used out of context. Remove it as it makes no sense here. - Very limited use of documentation. There are many paragraphs written with no documentations. This is not acceptable. - No need for the sections and sub-section in 1.1. Re-write the problem in a form of a paragraph merged with the Introduction. - The study significance and scope should be re-written as short paragraphs merged with the introduction section before the research questions. - There is no Literature Review Section. - No previous studies are presented to show the gap in the literature. - The research design should make it clear if the study is qualitative, quantitative or mixed method. - Section 3.1.4 "Relevant trainings attended" is no more than a discussion of previous studies. Weak section. - Reduce section 3.1 the Demographic Profile as much as you can as it is too long for a research paper. - Also reduce sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. - The Implications section is also very long. - The Conclusion Section is long. It should be one paragraph. - The APA style is highly recommended to use in this study in both in-text citations and in listing the references at the end. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language is good but needs some editing work.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nawal Fadhil Abbas
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq