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	**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** **v. Follow APA referencing style**	All the possible correction have been done in the revised manuscript
Minor REVISION comments	i. Re-arrange 'methodology' as 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')	Corrected
Optional/General comments	The paper is well written with touches of professionality. It shows pure empirical study with adequate statistics. I strongly advice the comments (both major and minor) above should be considered	Done

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	