

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_ARJASS_91867
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF HANDS-ON/MIND-ON LEARNING ACTIVITIES ON PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS` ACHIEVEMENT IN CULTURAL AND CREATIVE ARTS
Type of the Item	

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:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

[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 REVIEW comments	<p>Theme: Of an experiential nature with a social educational contribution.</p> <p>Summary: The objective of the research is well established in relation to the subject to be studied; the quasi-experimental method is conducive to this type of work, as is the applied technique; the methodology describes the process developed and the conclusions show an important contribution to the educational system. In general, this section is well developed.</p> <p>Keywords: The keywords allow locating the article when it is published. It is suggested to use the UNESCO THESAURS as a glossary of universal terminology that contributes to all areas. Education – Learning – Experimental Methodology...</p> <p>Introduction: The background, the problem and the justification are presented clearly and supported by appropriate literature. Once the subject of arts learning has been developed, it is intended to talk about gender but it is seen as out of context; It is necessary to integrate connectors that allow a coherent flow of the text worked on. The questions posed as hypotheses for research are viable.</p> <p>Methods and materials: The quasi-experimental design is appropriate, a case control is noted in the trial adequately; The selected population and the environment for the development of this study is pertinent; the techniques used as its methodology demonstrates a serious process. The formula used for the statistical analysis with its reliability value of 0.86 is acceptable.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: The results are presented without interpretation, that is, they are reliable and significant to develop an adequate discussion.</p> <p>The discussion is the most important section, where the findings must be put into dialogue with previous studies (if any). When no studies are found, it is original research and this is important when publishing a study. This is not indicated and it is suggested to indicate. The comparison is weak. It is suggested to review literature that can corroborate the new findings. (in the introduction there are some authors)</p> <p>No lines of research that can be generated as a result of this study are mentioned; The inconveniences raised in the investigation, if any, are not indicated either. It is recommended to review this section with the suggestions given.</p> <p>Conclusions: The conclusions respond to the objective of the study; however, this section does not require references.</p> <p>Bibliographic references: References are conducive to the topic. It is always recommended that they be at least between 40 -50 due to the strong theoretical support given to the findings. However, the requirement of the Journal must be taken into account.</p>	
Minor REVIEW comments	. however, the writing shows significant results in the educational area. if the author(s) take into account the suggestions given, their publication may be recommended.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Jverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador