

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_98724
Title of the Manuscript:	Instrument of Augmented Reality Technology Based Biology Practicum: Psychometrics Analysis
Type of the Article	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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the scale developed will be beneficial for the use of augmented reality in the schools who conduct biology practicals</p> <p>2. The title is good</p> <p>3. The abstract is also comprehensive, I have replaced coma “,” marks with decimal “.”. I think there was mistake in mentioning the values with coma.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. References are 63 in number. I think 30 references are enough and should be not older than 5 years or maximum 5 references 10 years old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The article is written in simple English. It is easy to understand for general public and readers	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Overall good work but matches with the following article: Omurtak, E. & Zeybek, G. (2022). The effect of augmented reality applications in biology lesson on academic achievement and motivation. Journal of Education in Science, Environment and Health (JESEH), 8(1), 55-74. https://doi.org/10.21891/jeseh.1059283	

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:	Shahnila Tariq
Department, University & Country	University of Management and Technology, Pakistan