

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> <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>1. Yes it is important.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract needs some further work due to the lack of the significance and research gap.</p> <p>4. The subsections are appropriate but the Literature Review Section is missing.</p> <p>5. Yes it is correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p> <p>7. The following are to meet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No need to underline the keywords which should be separated by commas rather than semi colons. - Editing is required. - Literature review section is required. - Some previous studies at the end of the Literature Review Section are required to show the gap. - The Methodology Section should make it clear the number of respondents: students and teachers. Also, it should contain something about the study design, model of analysis, and procedures. - Et al. should be italicized whenever it is used. - The list of References is to be reconsidered. For example, references 1 and 4 do not reflect the volume and issue numbers. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Nawal Fadhil Abbas
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq