



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>                            |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JESBS_49101   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>STEM Revisited: A Paradigm Shift in Teaching and Learning the Science Related Disciplines</b> |
| 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=sd-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there any differences between the abbreviation SRD and SLD? Could the authors check them carefully? If they are different, what does SLD mean? I could not find any words for SLD.</li> <li>2. An interesting paper but the reader is very difficult to identify the significant findings and results of the study. The authors are recommended to add a section to illustrate the critical points from their study.</li> </ol> |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 5, add SRD after Science Related Disciplines.</li> <li>2. Line 23, SLD or SRD? Lines 26, 29....</li> <li>3. Line 131, Fig. 1 or Figure 1?</li> <li>4. Line 143. Fig. 2 or Figure 2?</li> </ol>  |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | For academic writing, it is better not to use "we", "our" in expressing ideas. The authors could benchmark with other published papers which usually use passive voice to express ideas.   |  |

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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>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>Anthony Wong</b> |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Hong Kong</b>    |