

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_105886
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre-concept Transformation Teaching Strategy and Design of "Matter State Changes" in Junior High School Science
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important</p> <p>The title should reflect the scope which is however missing</p> <p>The abstract is incomplete. It should be bring out the concerns on pre-concepts and not concepts, highlight the objective(s), methodology adopted as well as the findings and conclusion to inform the reader what the article is all about</p> <p>The sub-sections are not well aligned to the scientific rigours of scientific writing</p> <p>No. A number of critical areas including problem, objective, methodology and findings are missing. The authors are giving results in raw form which makes it had to make scientific inferences. In some cases, the authors are using own experience as opposed to use of empirical evidence to demonstrate knowledge gaps</p> <p>My take is that the manuscript requires necessary attention that captures the problem, methodology as well as rigorous analysis to support necessary inferences</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Major Revamp recommended	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The manuscript does not meet the scientific rigour of an article to be published	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Timothy C. Okech</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>United States International University, Kenya</b>