

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AIR_104525 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Using Fidget Spinners and Stress Balls Do Not Impact College Introductory Psychology Test Scores |
| Type of the Article | Short 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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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. This manuscript has an interesting topic and potential to be published in AIR. It has an urgency for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. No, it was too short and not comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, but it needs improvement.</p> <p>5. Maybe.</p> <p>6. No, more references need to be added.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Yes. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Dear author</p> <p>I highly appreciate your hard work on this manuscript, but I have a few remarks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide 3-5 keywords according to MeSH Terms. 2. Mention the research design of the study. Is it qualitative or quantitative? Moreover, decide whether it is a quantitative-observational, quantitative-analysis or experimental study? 3. Explain why this study included 170 participants, is there any formula used to determine those numbers? 4. Add the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. 5. State the statistical analysis explanation in the method section; what statistical test was used (normality & homogeneity test, univariate, bivariate or multivariable) and what statistical analysis application was performed (STATA, SPSS, R or others). 6. Provide extra reliable references in the discussion section to gain the readers' trust. <p>Hope it helps to improve your manuscript's quality.</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: | Agung Riyanto Budi Santoso |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia |