

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_118658
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining College of Education Physical Education teachers Knowledge and skills in ICT integration in Physical Education
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:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. Yes. The manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. Yes. The title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes. The abstract is comprehensive. 4. Yes. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes. Scientifically the manuscript is correct. 6. Yes. It sufficient and recent.	I agree with the reviewer and therefore have improved the article. I have highlighted all areas edited in the manuscript. I have each discussions done under each research question and have improved on all areas notified.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ There is redundancy of sentence under introduction on the 1st paragraph.➤ Too nay abbreviations➤ It is better to use et al., rather than writing all authors name in the body of manuscript	

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>	