

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102142
Title of the Manuscript:	Educational Game Design Training Module on Newton's Laws for Secondary School Physics Teachers: A Need Analysis for Module Development
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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 topic is interesting. The findings show a reality that seems to respond not only to that country; but also to many of the countries of the world. Which should continue to be the subject of analysis and innovative proposals regarding education.</p> <p>The abstract contains the required elements; but it is not exposed en bloc, without identification of those elements, as it should be presented.</p> <p>The study design is quantitative and field; not surveys.</p> <p>They indicate having used a stratified sampling; however, they do not report which are the strata and how the distribution was made.</p> <p>Table 7 identifies the module content requirements. As they are written, they do not seem to account for their contents in their entirety.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, it is.	
<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:	Otaiza Cupare Castro
Department, University & Country	Centro de Estudios Regionales, Universidad Católica Andrés Bello, Venezuela