

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_88020
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR PHYSICS TEACHERS' CLASSROOM PRACTICES
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:

(<https://www.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please motivate more the urgency of the research in the introduction section. You could give such early finding you've observed so that there is a need to conduct the research.- You have to give some references in the introduction section, citing previous relevant works.- The authors mentioned validity and reliability. Where are they? I cannot find them in the manuscript. The result of validity and reliability.	I have rewritten the Introduction and included the references Cronbach's alpha coefficient value of 0.953 was stated in the article
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- First and second paragraph of Section 2.2 are identical to the first and second paragraph (some sentences) in Section 2.1.- Survey is tightly related to quantitative methods, instead, use interview.	Noted and has been duly rectified. The repetition in 2.2 has been deleted The use of interview will be considered in subsequent study. This current study was a survey and I only used questionnaire to gather data
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- I think research question can be merged in the introduction section instead of in a separate section.	I think so too since it is just one research question. Ive deleted that section

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)	No