



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_48101
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Problem-solving Technique on Chemistry students' Academic Performance in Stoichiometry in Senior Secondary Schools in Nigeria
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature is too lengthy. Some statements can be simplified with points can merge. Can rearrange the RQ, hypothesis into their own dedicated subsections. Easier to discuss with dedicated titles that represents the findings. Current formatting is more similar to report writing compared to article writing. Can also present findings in figure/illustration form. More interesting for reader to read. Give better perspective, in particular the significant difference in performance. The full mark for the score should be provided. Also include word 'score' in most of the table to let readers understand easier. 	We have tried to incorporate the suggestions made by the reviewer and authors are really appreciate the way of reviewing the manuscript
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some grammatical errors here and there Some typos, missing dot, spacing between words. Revisit the article carefully and eliminate these mistakes 	Grammatical and Typos errors have been removed from the text matter

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>	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	Originality report is at 29%. Should reduce to below 20%	