

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_102260
Title of the Manuscript:	Teachers and students perspectives on group work in learning Geography
Type of the 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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 paper explores the understanding of teachers and students about group work learning aiming to reveal the benefits and challenges of group work.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes. I would suggest not using abbreviations in the abstract, e.g., GW and FGDs.</p> <p>4. The introduction is very limited and needs more elaboration. Each study variable, i.e., group work, its relation to learning, differences/similarities between students' and teachers' understanding of group work, needs more explanation based on literature and previous studies.</p> <p>Also, there is confusion and mixture in the subsections of the manuscript. It starts with "1. Introduction", and continuous with "1. Methods". Later, another section "2. Introduction" begins again but continues with number 3. The follow of the sub/sections needs revision.</p> <p>I recommend having Results and Discussion sections separate, and presenting the research findings separate from the previous findings in the literature. Also, I would make it clear which finding came from which form of data (from observations, focus groups, interviews).</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sample in observations is very few for saturation. So, I would not mention about saturation in this paper. - It was mentioned that "The results are discussed under each research question as discussed below." However, the research questions were not clearly stated. - The interview and observation protocol needs more explanation. For example, it is not clear what was asked in the structured interviews, what was discussed in focus groups, and what was observed in observation protocol. Similarly, how this rich data was analysed. It was mentioned that inductive approach was used. How and which codes were appeared? - I would revise this sentence "This paper suggests the best practices to maximize the approach to create more effective group work learning" since it generalizes beyond it should be. - There was not any information why the subject geography was chosen and why it is important to study this topic in this field. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Throughout the manuscript, there were unfinished sentences. 	
<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:	Bilge Gencoglu
Department, University & Country	University of Groningen, Netherlands