

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_127951
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of the Project-Based Seamless Learning Model on Critical Thinking of Prospective Educator Students
Type of the Article	Methods of Learning

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript "The Effect of the Project-Based Seamless Learning Model on Critical Thinking of Prospective Educator Students" holds significant importance for the scientific community as it explores innovative educational methodologies that bridge the gap between theory and practice. By focusing on the project-based seamless learning model, the study provides valuable insights into how integrated learning experiences can enhance critical thinking skills among future educators. This research contributes to the growing body of literature on effective pedagogical strategies, offering evidence that can guide curriculum development and teaching practices aimed at fostering higher-order thinking skills in students. Moreover, it highlights the potential of seamless learning environments in promoting active, real-world problem-solving, an essential competence for educators in today's dynamic educational landscape.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes, it is.</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract outlines the study's aim, methodology, results, and key findings, but it could benefit from some revisions to enhance clarity, conciseness, and completeness. Here's a breakdown of how it can be improved: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clarity and Structure:</b> The abstract could be more organized by separating key components more clearly. For example, the methodology section could be rewritten for clarity and to avoid redundancy, particularly in the description of the research design. The results section can be tightened to focus on the most important findings.</li> <li><b>Grammar and Flow:</b> There are some minor grammatical and punctuation errors that could be revised to improve readability.</li> <li><b>Adding Context:</b> It would be useful to briefly mention why the project-based seamless learning model is important in the context of critical thinking for prospective educators, and how it might contribute to the existing literature.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> The process of controlling for potential confounding variables should be better outlined. <input type="checkbox"/> The <b>validity</b> and <b>reliability</b> of the tests used to measure critical thinking should be clarified. <input type="checkbox"/> It would be beneficial to report the <b>effect size</b> to provide a fuller understanding of the impact of the learning model.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>In its current form, the language of the article could benefit from revisions to improve grammatical accuracy, clarity, and academic tone. The language is suitable for communication but requires careful editing to meet the high standards of scholarly writing typically expected in academic publications. Focusing on conciseness, proper grammar, clear sentence structure, and appropriate academic phrasing will improve its suitability for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>These suggestions aim to strengthen the manuscript and ensure that it adheres to the rigorous standards expected in scholarly communications. By providing clearer explanations of the intervention, sample, and statistical analysis, as well as acknowledging limitations and future research directions, the manuscript will be more comprehensive and impactful. Additionally, improving the language quality will help make the research more accessible to a broader academic audience.</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the abstract of the manuscript "<b>The Effect of the Project-Based Seamless Learning Model on Critical Thinking of Prospective Educator Students</b>", there are no explicit ethical concerns mentioned. However, there are several <b>ethical considerations</b> that should be addressed in the manuscript to ensure it meets ethical standards typically required in scientific research, especially in educational and social sciences.</p> <p><b>At present, based on the abstract alone, no explicit competing interests are identified. However, the authors should ensure that any potential competing interests—whether financial, professional, or institutional—are disclosed in the manuscript to maintain transparency and academic integrity. It is standard practice in academic publishing to include a competing interests statement in the manuscript, where the authors explicitly declare any potential conflicts, and this should be addressed prior to submission for publication. This helps to ensure the credibility and objectivity of the research findings.</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><u>Reviewer's comment</u></p>	<p><u>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)</u></p>
<p><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Dhuha Fadhil Abbas</b></p>
<p><b>Department, University &amp; Country</b></p>	<p><b>University of Babylon, Iraq</b></p>