

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>)

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>I commend the researcher's endeavor in writing this study. This paper adds to the existing scholarship. To improve the technical approach, clarity, and scientific validity of this research article, I would suggest the following matters and standpoints:</p> <p>1. The abstract and introduction are two different sections of a research article and they should be written differently from each other. It is recommended to incorporate a research introduction that is distinct from the content that is found in the abstract. The introduction of the paper must include an explanation of the key terms, the rationale, the gap, the justification, and other variables of research.</p> <p>2. The abstract presents an accurate synopsis of the paper, but readers might also want to see and read the research design and theories used.</p> <p>3. The researcher incorporated some research subsections and main sections such as the abstract, introduction, conclusion, and references but the reader might want to see and read some other research parts such as theoretical background and methodology.</p> <p>4. The subsections and the contents are well explained but it is suggested to maintain the academic and objective tone of the paper. This can be done by utilizing the third-person pronoun and not the first-person.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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:	Kimberth D. Obeso
Department, University & Country	College of Arts and Sciences, Cebu Normal University, Philippines