

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_89739
Title of the Manuscript:	Experiences of Physical Education Teachers on Students' Assessment In Times Of Covid-19 Pandemic
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> )

## Review Form 1.6

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. In the Title subheading, change the word "In" with "in" and "Of" with "of".</p> <p>2. In the Abstract subsection</p> <p>(a) The authors should state the research methodology used explicitly. Please complete it</p> <p>(b) The author has not described the findings/results of the research conducted. Please add it.</p> <p>3. In the Introduction subsection</p> <p>(a) Authors need to state/mention the purpose of the research in the introduction subsection after reviewing why the research topic is essential or after reviewing the gap analysis. Please complete it.</p> <p>(b) The author must complete a description of the previous related work in the Introduction subsection and show that this work differs from previous related studies. Please add it.</p> <p>4. In the Conclusion and Recommendation subsection</p> <p>(a) Consider changing the subheading: Conclusion and Recommendation with Conclusion.</p> <p>(b) It is not customary to provide explanations/descriptions of recommendations/suggestions for further research with lengthy explanations. Reviewers suggest replacing it with short, concise, clear text sentences. Thank you</p> <p>5. In the Reference subheading</p> <p>Reference numbers 1,2,3,5,6,7,17, and 20 should be deleted and replaced with references from other sources because these references are not suitable (not qualified) to be used as reference sources in reputable scientific journals.</p> <p>Notes: Reference sources used in reputable scientific articles are scientific journal articles, articles on seminar proceedings, and books. While references taken from the internet in the form of emails, individual works/perceptions, discussion materials, or the like that are not seminar articles, workshop articles, scientific journal articles, or proceeding articles do not qualify as references.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Anthony Anggrawan
Department, University & Country	University of Bumigora, Indonesia