

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_106123
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation of Multirepresentation Based Physics Modules to Improve Students Critical Thinking Skills
Type of the Article	Review Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Research and development is not a proper methodology.</p> <p>Who completed the module feasibility assessment? Describe the sample and validity / reliability.</p> <p>You mention student responses. How? When? Response rate? Sample? Validity and reliability?</p> <p>You mention on page 6 that there were two observers. Who did this? When? How recorded? How analyzed? Purpose? Did both observers have to agree?</p> <p>You mentioned you the following in the abstract: "Collecting data in a study, namely questionnaires, interviews, observations or observations, tests and documentation." You do not mention that you did all of these steps, such as interviews or review of documentation. You mention the same factors under 3.4, but you do not elaborate.</p> <p>How did you measure your study's validity/reliability, delimitations, and limitations?</p> <p>"Input from expert/expert validation will be used as input for revising the draft 1 module that was made. Module products that have been revised into draft 2 modules will then enter the trial phase." Will be? Not done? How were the modules constructed?</p> <p>The conclusion does not provide any new information and lacks citations. A conclusion should not simply rehash every point previously mentioned; such redundancies detract from the article.</p> <p>You research methodologies and methods are not clear. You do not clearly describe the samples involved and how implemented. Was there no control group? Did all instructors presenting the modules have the same ability?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>First sentence of abstract does not make sense.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA