

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ARJASS_117887
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Pedagogical Potential of Schenkerian Analysis in Japan: A Case Study on Teaching with Schenkerian Graphs
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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. The manuscript addresses an important gap in music education in Japan by exploring the application of Schenkerian analysis among non-music majors. Given the limited adoption of Schenkerian techniques in Japan and the potential for these methods to enhance musical understanding, this research is valuable. It contributes to both music theory education and the broader pedagogical strategies for teaching complex theoretical concepts to students without extensive backgrounds in the subject.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-structured.</p> <p>5. The study appears to be scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. The references cited in the manuscript are relevant and include recent studies that support the research context and methodology.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally good, but there are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need correction. A thorough proofreading and editing for language clarity would enhance the readability and professionalism of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider providing more detailed examples or case studies within the main text to illustrate the practical application of Schenkerian graphs in the classroom. Including visual aids or diagrams of the Schenkerian graphs discussed in the study would be beneficial for readers unfamiliar with these analytical tools. Further discussion on how the findings of this study could be generalized to other educational contexts or countries would add value. 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Berk Ceviz
Department, University & Country	Turkey