

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_99743
Title of the Manuscript:	The Walk-in Observation: The perception of teachers on its impact on classroom instruction and pedagogy
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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)	The manuscript is important for improving teaching activities among teachers. The title is not clear. It should be "Teachers' Perception of Walk-in Observation and Its Impacts on Instruction and Pedagogy". The abstract is not comprehensive. The research methods and results of quantitative data and qualitative data analysis should be presented. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically correct, however some revisions are required. The references are sufficient. The presentation of mean score in abstract and table should be checked.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is suitable for scholarly communication, however, grammar should be checked.	
Optional/General comments	Addition research methods and results should be added in an abstract.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sununta Youngwanichsetha
Department, University & Country	Eastern Asia University, Thailand