



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>)

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 paper describes the "Flipped Classroom", mainly based on material that's minimum 5 years old. The current development of Flipped Learning 3.0 with the Flipped Learning Standards and the 187 Global Elements of Effective Teaching in Flipped Learning (presented 2017 in Istanbul) is missing. This makes the paper incomplete.</p> <p>The terms "Flipped Classroom" and "Flipped Learning" are mixed up several times (because they are not the same).</p> <p>Several statements do not fit to scientific style or miss the necessary reference or use not matching reference. Here an example: "A number of researchers have successfully utilized Flipped classroom." (Page 7, last line in the last paragraph). – Cited is Williams, 2002 – that was 10 years before the concept of Flipped Classroom has been published.</p> <p>References are missing (for example Travis, 2014) or incorrect (for example http://flippedlearning.org/site/Default.aspx?PageID=92)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Language might be revised. Statements like "don't" and "it's" should not be used in scientific papers.</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:	Peter Mazohl
Department, University & Country	Vienna University of Technology, Austria