



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_51666
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Effectiveness Analysis Assessment of Physics Teaching Materials-Oriented ICARE Method on Student Cognitive Mastery Based Experiment Skill Level
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's commentC	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>This is an interesting report about a teaching strategy with the purpose of promoting active learning; it assesses the effectiveness of written materials to teach Physics.</p> <p>Introduction presents relevant antecedents and describes ICARE design of worksheets.</p> <p>However, there are two important flaws.</p> <p>First one is that ICARE is the acronym for Introduction, Connect, Apply, Reflect, Extend, and these stages organize the structure of the material, so it would be important to present a conceptual framework that serves to justify this design and also, to interpret results.</p> <p>The second one is methodology used, and there are two aspects to highlight. On one hand, although descriptive statistics can be used as a preliminary study, establishing the existence of differences between groups needs the use of inferential instruments.</p> <p>On the other, it is not clear if the purpose is to inquire the existence of differences between the groups or between each group before and afterward the application of the strategy. Once this is clear up, it must be informed which was the procedure to collect data.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Some sentences or paragraphs are redacted in a way that makes them difficult to read and understand (for example, lines from 60 to 70 or 145-146).	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Católica del Uruguay (UCU), Uruguay</i>