

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_104056
Title of the Manuscript:	When the Artist Studio is Alive, Art is Alive: Empowering Art Educators and Students through Live Studio Practice
Type of the Article	Review 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:

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

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections are comprehensive.</p> <p>5. It is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p> <p>7. The following are to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Editing id required. - The research gap, significance and research questions are not clear in the abstract. Besides the number of texts analysed in not clear. - The findings in the abstract should reflect the research questions. - The second section should be titled 'Literature Review' instead of 'Theoretical Framework and Concepts'. - Research Design and Approach and its subsections should be under the main heading 'Methodology'. - The two sections 'Results' and 'Discussion' carry the same number. - The Limitation section should be a separate section. - In the reference list, the second and third lines should be indented. Besides, the Titles of books and journals should be italicized. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nawal Fadhil Abbas
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq