SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_47602**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative Effectiveness of Mastery and Peer-to-Peer Learning Strategies in Improving Junior Secondary Students' Learning Outcomes in Basic Science**
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:

(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	Line 33 – Science, called natural philosophy, was assumed to do this in Aristotle's time (4th Century BCE) if you wish to note it.	
Optional/General comments	An excellent paper. Well documented. Under your final section "Recommendations", perhaps one could be a continued study with a test group of 500 (instead of 50). Also, was there a difference between males and females in this study? No where do you mention this.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Alan Garfield*
Department, University & Country	*University of Dubuque, USA*

SDI Review Form 1.6