

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_101324</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Recommended Instructional Approach in Ghanaian Basic Schools; A Review of Constructivist Approach of Teaching and Learning</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>YES, however the age of the papers is somewhat old being mostly in the 1995 - 2004 period, which corresponds to when Constructivism was "au fait" having been superceded by inquiry-based science education in science and the equivalent in mathematics.</b></p> <p><b>Even considering the age of the papers, I was surprised that von Glasersfeld (1995) wasn't included nor anything by Paul Ernst or Barbara Jaworski.</b></p> <p><b>This review would benefit from an analysis of why Constructivism has waned in the literature and what has replaced it, and more recent works commenting on constructivism in the current state of play.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Check and review the language	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Follow journal guidelines	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Tom McCloughlin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dublin City University, Ireland</b>