

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>)

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 for the scientific community, as it presents a new aspect on the toys usefulness as an advance for school performance in college students.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate. It builds on the findings of the study and I find that quite interesting.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, direct, objective and correct.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are suitable for a short research article.</p> <p>5. I think yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The text informs everything it has to inform, allowing other researchers to replicate the study, if they are interested. Study design and analysis statistics are adequate and correct.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Nothing to declare	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raquel Rangel Cesario
Department, University & Country	Centro Universitário Municipal de Franca, Brazil