

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_101708
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of electronic resources in teaching and learning Physics in higher secondary schools under Pemagatshel District
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.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The theme that the manuscript deals with is important with the work of teachers who are not specialists in their subject or, as the article expresses it, outside their field.</p> <p>Yes, and in addition to a lot of interest as a subject.</p> <p>Meets the abstract of an article, but the keywords for this article are missing</p> <p>Treat the issue correctly</p> <p>I think that it would only be improved with a revision in its writing.</p> <p>No, the number of references meets the review standard.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	VERY GOOD SCIENTIFIC WORK	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Manuel Salum Tomé
Department, University & Country	Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile