



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_59227
Title of the Manuscript:	Incorporating Collaborative Teaching in Student- Teacher Education
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Citations should be 2010 and above ii. Purpose of the study; significance of the study; and hypotheses should be moved after introduction but before statement of problem iii. Statement of Problem should be clearly stated before literature review iv. Research Design should be clearly stated at the beginning of methodology v. Validity and reliability of the instrument should be clearly mentioned vi. Under 4.1.1 Testing of Hypotheses Each hypothesis should be stated clearly and not muddled up in the body of sentences. For example, Hypothesis 1 There is no statistically significant difference between students taught with collaborative teaching and those taught using traditional method of teaching. Then, this should be followed by the tables; interpretation of the tables; and discussion of findings <p>v. Follow APA referencing style</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Re-arrange 'methodology' as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Research Design 3.2 Population and Sample (not participant) of the Study 3.3 Procedure for Data Collection 3.4 Research Instrument (instead of 'Tool of the Study') 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is well written with touches of professionalism. It shows pure empirical study with adequate statistics. I strongly advice the comments (both major and minor) above should be considered</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oladosu, Adebiji Toyosi
Department, University & Country	College of Education, Ikere, Nigeria