

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97559
Title of the Manuscript:	Educational Program Based on Virtual Environments to Improve Learning in the Physical Education Area
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1 Needed revision 2 Yes 3. There should be introduction of the topic in abstract part 4 Yes to some extent 5 There are lot of flaws in METHODOLOGY part that needs elaboration as; which scale i.e Likert scale either 3-point or more is used. 6 References needed years (as UNESCO, UNICEF, etc) in introduction part. Suggestion part is missing that may be added based on conclusion to solve the drawbacks pointed out in this study.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of language is poor and needs revision	
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:	Muhammad Arshad
Department, University & Country	National College of Business Administration and Economics, Pakistan