Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JESBS_89022**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparison of Online Learning during the Covid-19 pandemic against the traditional face-to-face learning experience for a STEM related subject, Analytical**
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	*I. Abstract Notes;* *Abstract needs to be improved a bit, because* *1. The research method needs to be presented in an abstract briefly* *2. The results of the quantitative discussion must be written briefly in the abstract* *3. A brief conclusion in the abstract must be written.* *4. Pay attention to key words because they have not been adapted to the topic of the article, especially online learning and traditional face-to-face learning* *II. Methodology Notes;* *The research methodology needs to be improved again, because the presentation is too long, it should be presented briefly and clearly what research methods are used, what data collection techniques are and what data analysis techniques are and who the respondents and hypotheses should not be presented* *III. Conclusion Notes;* *This conclusion needs to be revised again because;* *1. Still writing expert opinion or theory, it shouldn't be required to write it in conclusion* *2. The presentation of the conclusions does not yet describe the quantitative results of how big the difference is in the form of numbers or percentages accompanied by a narrative description so that readers can understand the meaning of the topic of this article.* *IV. In writing articles, usually there are no points of limitations and suggestions. It's better to just delete it, but if this journal requires it in a template, it must be written down.* *V. Usually in article writing there are no attachment points. And must be deleted* *VI. We recommend that the number of pages of this article be reduced to 9-10 pages*	
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)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Kapraja Sangadji**
Department, University & Country	**Ambon State Islamic Institute Indonesia, Indonesia**