

Manuscript: “**Interactive-Invention Instructional Strategy and Secondary School Students’ Achievement in Selected Electromagnetic Concepts in Ibadan North Local Government Area (LGA), Nigeria**”

Submitted: 09 December 2021

Accepted: 04 February 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Edidiong Enyeneokpon Ukoh

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p38

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Sufi Amin, International Islamic University, Islamabad Pakistan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sufi Amin	
University/Country: International Islamic University, Islamabad Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 17-01-02022	Date Review Report Submitted: 17-01-02022
Manuscript Title: Interactive-Invention Instructional Strategy and Secondary School Students' Achievement in selected Electromagnetic Concepts in Ibadan North L. G. A., Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1275/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title of the paper is clear and adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The research objectives/methods/result is significant and well framed. The	

researcher has designed it very well, conducted researcher in proper way and the thesis has due weightage	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The write-up needs careful editing in terms of linguistic and format aspects.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The research method needs elaboration.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The length of the paper is very big. It is recommended that to reduce the length of the paper up to 18 pages.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Conclusions should be based on findings.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
In some reference are not according to APA format. It is recommended that to follow APA format in references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your

review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 04/01	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/01
Manuscript Title: Interactive-Invention Instructional Strategy and Secondary School Students' Achievement in some Electromagnetic Concepts in Ibadan North L. G. A., Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 75.12.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is clear (maybe it could be improved by writing "regarding Electromagnetic Concepts " instead of in some Electromagnetic Concepts)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is clear, complete and summarises the main points of the article.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
The article needs more through proofreading because of frequent lack of subject-verb agreement and not very clear syntax (e.g. the level of these developments determine p.2, The objectives [...]is p.3, etc.). Moreover, the layout should be more	

consistently edited (font size, line spacing, etc.)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Unlike the other parts of the article, the conclusions are not accurate and do not summarise the paper	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author(s),

Your article is interesting and deals with a relevant problem. However, I think it could be improved by more thorough proofreading and editing; charts could also be helpful. Moreover, the conclusions could be expanded to link back to the problem and help the reader understand why your research should matter.

I hope you will find my comments useful. I suggest that you show your changes by underlining them or using a different colour.

Best regards,
The Reviewer

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is interesting and well-organized, but it definitely needs further proofreading and editing to be published.