



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_49941
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing class IX Students participants in group work in chemistry
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	This manuscript informs about an action research with the purpose of inquiring which effects has teaching strategies designed to encourage pupils to participate in group work. It poses an interesting issue: to find ways to go from lecture teaching to active learning. Methodological design is accurate, using a pre-post test to find eventual changes that could be a result of teaching intervention. However, there are no statistical analysis that could serve to state differences found. Also, there are only few mentions to other sources, such as class observation or questions posed by students. Sections 7, 8 and 9 are mixed, so it takes a time to order them to be able to understand what is said in each one. This problem must be solve, before this part of the work can be assessed.	
Minor REVISION comments	At pages 6 and 7 are used expressions like "Many studies..." or "...literature review..." but there are no mentions to any of these references. Some of them must be stated. At page 2, paragraph beginning with "Role in group work" or at page 6, sentence beginning with "Acountability" make no sense. There are other places where syntax or punctuation are wrong. It should be revised.	
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Católica del Uruguay (UCU), Uruguay</i>