



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_64699
Title of the Manuscript:	Affordances of Flipped Classrooms: Unveiling the Paradox of Basics and Key Principles of Flipped Learning
Type of the Article	Review 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The document should be restructured, where the systematic review, research is displayed, contains the author's position and criteria and reflects the relevance of the flipped classroom within education, using updated bibliography</p> <p>The abstract does not clearly visualize the objective of the research, nor is the methodology, results and conclusions. This very general, you must restructure it</p> <p>Everything is too theoretical there is no evidence of a position, or analysis that leads to the conclusions raised</p> <p>It is not clearly visualized what he proposes in the summary "roles, processes and step by step what really happens inside and outside"</p> <p>It is not explained on the basis that it is concluded that: "the satisfaction of the students increased" but there was evidence of a development in this process</p> <p>Nor is it demonstrated on the basis of the claim that: "Instructors illustrated that classroom practice brought student learning to an interactive way ..."</p> <p>Conclusions are raised that are not evidenced during the development of the research</p> <p>The research is too theoretical and with outdated sources of more than five years ago, when this topic is a current topic and there is a lot of current bibliography and with truly transformative experiences</p> <p>The position of the author is not reflected is too little</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the introduction in the theoretical part, there are few bibliographic citations according to the APA standards.</p> <p>Tables and graphs does not meet the presentation standards and is not standardized</p>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María de los Angeles Mayorga Alvarez
Department, University & Country	Ecuador