

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_128478
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Class X students' Learning in Geography through Collaborative Approach (Focused on Class X A and B of Udorong Central School)
Type of the Article	Research Paper

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is basically an experiential study supporting the use of Collaborative approach in teaching and learning.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is Suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive. I have edited it. Please check the document.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The research is basically an experiential work. It is in line with already proved methodologies.  However, the work suffers from methodological flaw: (Please refer the document) You have mentioned an interventionist approach and brought two groups together. Ideally you should have a control group. This study is not about a comparison between two sections. As the researcher has claimed the comparison between methods of teaching, one group will be exposed to collaborative learning, the other group should not be. Though you have done pre and post intervention, what was the need for taking two sections separately? How does pre-post intervention work as evidence that collaborative learning is successful? Pre test always shows the current standard of the students. Here, Post test has shown improvement but how do you guarantee that because of strategy change this has happened? As we all know learning happens with time. So, at the same point one has achieved and the other didn't because one was exposed to and the other wasn't. Ideally one section should have been taken as the control group. In that way, you could have proved that CL is a success. Therefore, the study has a methodological flaw.  However, avoid using the word effectiveness. I have deleted it to make the paper acceptable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	

### Review Form 3

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language needs to be edited. I have edited it. Please check the document.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Comments are summarized below:  Please note you are talking of effectiveness of Collaborative Teaching and Learning Approaches but your methodology has a flaw. Therefore, you may avoid the word "effectiveness".  If you write anything in your literature review, you should have data to support. Your research does not present any such data related to the references you have used in Literature Review  Several paragraphs have been deleted as those do not fit in a research paper.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shewli Hira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Swami Vivekananda Subharti University, India</b>