

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_101844
Title of the Manuscript:	Paedagogos (Pedagogue) and Demiurgos (Creator). A Study on Ambiguity, Polysemy and Reversal . Pedagogy and Creation in Ancient Greek Culture, Education and Drama.
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>The first part of the title can be deleted since it gives English translations that appear in the second half of the title. Hence, the title can be "A Study on Ambiguity, Polysemy and Reversal: Pedagogy and Creation in Ancient Greek Culture, Education and Drama"</p> <p>Keywords are normally in single digit (between five and seven)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Good	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Research questions that are formed at the initial stage of research can be mentioned as part of introduction instead of mentioning them at the beginning of different sections.</p> <p>2. Introduction and the abstract should explicitly mention the thesis statement since the study is a qualitative one.</p> <p>3. Paragraph with more than seven to nine lines can be divided into two paragraphs with topic sentences of their own.</p> <p>4. It is better for the author to state the background to the study in the introduction, the limitations of the study and the scope for further research as part of the conclusion.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeyearaj John Sekar
Department, University & Country	The American College, India