

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100779
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (TPSR) AND TEACHING GAMES FOR UNDERSTANDING (TGFU) MODELS WITH SELF-EFFICACY ON LEARNING OUTCOMES OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, SPORTS, AND HEALTH
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)

Review Form 1.7

<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>THE EFFECTS OF TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (TPSR) AND TEACHING GAMES FOR UNDERSTANDING (TGfU) MODELS WITH SELF-EFFICACY ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION, SPORTS, AND HEALTH LEARNING OUTCOMES: quasi experimental STUDY</p> <p>Not structured; otherwise, fine.</p> <p>No, too much introduction, too little discussion; it's better to rewrite.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, the references are not in good format and are not mentioned in the text.</p> <p>It is better to mention the duration of study as 1 year from-to</p> <p>Keywords are better to be in alphabetical order; MeSH terms are better not to be in the title.</p> <p>It is better to mention which method was used for sampling. questionnaire is standardised ? Better to mention Sample size is how you calculated it better to mention. Conclusions are better as paragraphs. Any limitations or recommendations are better to add. What are the steps taken in the methodology to decrease bias? It's better to mention where the Tucker test was used. It's better to check typo errors, as Anava mentioned some times. Overall, nice study.</p> <p>It's better to cut the references also.</p> <p>Ethical committee number and consent better to mention.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It's ok, but too many short forms may sometimes cause difficulty for the reader.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After revisions, it became a nice article.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Rakesh Kotha</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Osmania University, India</p>