

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_101844</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Paedagogos (Pedagogue) and Demiurgos (Creator). A Study on Ambiguity, Polysemy and Reversal . Pedagogy and Creation in Ancient Greek Culture, Education and Drama.</b>
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> )

### 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>1. This research is important for the scientific community, but the writing does not yet represent good scientific writing. The introductory section is not written correctly according to scientific standards. For example, what and why the research is important, is there any research relevant to this research, how is the research methodology carried out, all of which are not mentioned.</p> <p>2. The title is too convoluted, unfocused.</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive, just copy pasted the beginning of the introduction.</p> <p>4. Not all are suitable. It is not clear which part of the method, the analysis part, and the author's conclusion part.</p> <p>5. This manuscript must be totally revised, references must be updated, there must also be novelty and renewal in this research so that it is worthy of being called a scientific work.</p> <p>6. Very old reference.</p> <p><b>The writing of references does not consistently follow international standards. References are also not updated. I suggest authors read other people's scientific articles, especially articles in this journal. The template must follow the intended journal.</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>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Serious Major revision	

### 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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Herman Rusli</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia</b>