



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_29051
Title of the Manuscript:	Computer Asissted Teaching and Learning (CATL) to Improve Academic Achievement and Skill in Science-Physics
Type of the Article	Short 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>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. You have incorrect grammar (subject-verb agreement issues and tense switching) throughout the paper. There appears to be words missing throughout the paper too causing great confusion for the reader.</p> <p>I suggest very strongly that you find a native English speaker who has editing experience to review your paper before you resubmit it. As it stands, though your ideas are good, the poor grammar detracts from your thoughts.</p> <p>2. The subject is physics not "science-physics."</p> <p>3. Finally, your methodology is inaccurate. you say that you are doing a case study and then present statistics. This inconsistency and inaccuracy is problematic.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	B. Chametzky
Department, University & Country	Pennsylvania, United States