

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_88417
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Ethics in Physics Instruction in Secondary Schools
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. In abstract 9 th line it is stated as "THESE existed" instead of There and also line 13 Stated as 'teachers of Physics should avail themselves with', instead of AVAIL better use the word Equip . 2. Under heading introduction, teaching of science and ethics (citizenship) was excessively elaborated, better put the same in a capsule form. (Up to page No.3.) 3. As per 'purpose of the study' a question is framed- 'iii) What are the ethical benefits of physics instruction?', and the same is repeated in hypotheses. Hence, let it be a statement . 4. Under Research Question II, Table 2 last row contains 'Decision', for item.3 it is just stated as Strongly and for item.6 it is stated as 56 (224), And item 9 stated as STRONG agreed. please elaborate . 5. Findings may be stated in a sequential way .	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Nearly 14 references are cited, kindly follow standardized format (Some books are in <i>italics</i> and other are not) 2. Kluwer, Tytler, R. (2007). Re-imaging science education engaging students in science for Australian] future: seems to be incomplete .	
Optional/General comments	When you frame research questions there is no need for any hypotheses.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Samuel Babu
Department, University & Country	St. Joseph's Pg College, India