

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_91207
Title of the Manuscript:	Teaching seasons with a hands-on activity
Type of the Article	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:

<https://www.journaliaari.com/index.php/IAARJ/editorial-policy>

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	<p>The topic is interesting, yet the paper lacks the scientific research methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A thorough editing is highly recommended. Many language problems and misuse of conjunctions are there all over the paper. 2. The abstract needs to be re-written where attention is paid to include: the aim of the study, the research question, the study sample, the significance, the model applied and some conclusions and recommendations. 3. There is no full stop at the end of the keywords which should not be written italics. 4. Reading the whole paper, there is no scientific research methodology at all. 5. The whole paper is a survey in geography. 6. There is no research problem or gap. 7. There is no related literature review. 8. There are no previous studies. 9. No introduction to the topic related to the field language teaching. 10. No section of Methodology where the researcher states: the research design, the research instrument, data collection and selection, then data analysis. 11. No section of data analysis is provided. 12. No experiment is done. 13. No proper procedures. 14. No results are discussed. 15. No section relating this study to other studies in this regard. 16. The conclusion is weak. 17. References are poorly written: they should be entered in hanging style; that is, the first line of the entry should be left-justified, with the following lines indented five spaces. Italicize book titles, journal titles, and volume numbers. Write the complete information about each reference. 	Thanks for the comments. We try to fulfill all requests made.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	