

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_126646
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Project-Based Learning Model on Concept Understanding
Type of the Article	

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: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the title is relatively succinct, you might explore rephrasing it for brevity. For example, "Evaluating Project-Based Learning's Impact on Concept Understanding" is a more concise option. • To engage a broader audience, you might want to hint at the context or implications, such as "Enhancing Student Engagement and Understanding through Project-Based Learning." • • The title is clear in conveying that the study is investigating the effectiveness of a specific learning model (Project-Based Learning) in enhancing understanding of concepts. • • Consider specifying which concepts or subjects you are addressing. For example, "mathematical concepts" or "scientific concepts" could make the title more targeted. <p>Overall, your title sets a solid foundation for research that seems relevant and significant in educational settings.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract clearly outlines the aims, methods, results, and conclusion, which is good. However, consider refining the language in some sections for better clarity. For example, instead of saying "the research method used quantitative model," you could say "the research employed a quantitative experimental design." You mention "quasi-experimental" and "nonequivalent pretest posttest group design" but it would be helpful to briefly explain what these terms entail for readers unfamiliar with them. The statement about a significance value > 0.050 seems contradictory to typical reporting standards in research, where a p-value < 0.05 is often considered significant. Consider revising this for accuracy. You may want to clarify what the significance values imply. The conclusion reiterates the main finding but could emphasize the implications of this finding. How might this approach influence future teaching practices or educational models? 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear IMRaD structure: The sections are clearly defined and follow a logical progression. Comprehensive Literature Review: The literature review adequately covers project-based learning, seamless learning, and concept understanding, providing context and justifying the study. Detailed Methodology: The methods section is quite thorough in describing the research design, participants, data collection, and analysis techniques. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsectioning: While the literature review is well-structured into subsections (Project-Based Learning, Seamless Learning, Concept Understanding), the introduction could benefit from additional subsections to better organize the background information and the research problem. Breaking it into smaller logical chunks (e.g., "The Importance of Concept Understanding in Early Childhood Education", "Limitations of Traditional Teaching Methods," "Project-Based Seamless Learning as a Solution") would improve readability. Results Section Clarity: The results section presents statistical data effectively, but could benefit from clearer verbal descriptions accompanying the tables. For instance, instead of just stating "Based on table 1...", add sentences that interpret the findings in plain language for the reader, summarizing key findings from each table. Discussion Section Depth: The discussion section could be strengthened by more explicitly linking the findings to the literature review. For each significant result, discuss how it aligns with or contradicts existing research, and explore potential explanations for unexpected findings. A more detailed discussion of the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research would also strengthen this section. Conclusion: The conclusion section is too brief. It should provide a more comprehensive summary of the key findings and their implications. Consider expanding the conclusion to reiterate the main findings, discuss their practical significance, and highlight any limitations. <p>In summary, the manuscript's structure is fundamentally sound, but more strategic subsectioning and clearer, more interpretive language throughout (especially in the Results and Discussion) sections would significantly improve its overall readability and impact.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its use of a quantitative, quasi-experimental design with a control group, allowing for a comparison of the project-based seamless learning model's impact on concept understanding. The application of appropriate statistical tests (independent samples t-test) to analyze the data, along with pre-tests to establish baseline differences, strengthens the study's internal validity. The inclusion of a comprehensive literature review provides a solid foundation for the research question and contextualizes the findings within existing scholarship. However, a deeper discussion of limitations and potential confounding variables would further enhance its scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference list is reasonably comprehensive, covering various aspects of project-based learning, seamless learning, and concept understanding. The majority of the cited works appear relatively recent, suggesting the authors have consulted current literature. To enhance the manuscript's rigor and persuasiveness, I would suggest adding references that explicitly investigate: Specific measures of concept understanding: The manuscript mentions concept understanding, but could benefit from citing studies that detail specific and validated assessment methods for measuring concept understanding in the relevant subject area. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language in the manuscript is understandable but could be improved for scholarly communication. While the meaning is generally clear, there are instances of awkward phrasing, grammatical inconsistencies, and stylistic issues that detract from the overall professionalism and clarity.</p> <p>Example 1 (Sentence Structure):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original: "The research data were analyzed using descriptive techniques and Independent Sample T-Test techniques. The purpose was to determine the significance level of the effectiveness of project-based seamless learning on concept understanding by testing the difference in the average value of students' project competency learning outcomes. However, before conducting this test, researchers first conducted a prerequisite test of research assumptions using normality and homogeneity tests, so that the assumptions of data parameters were met." Improved: "Descriptive statistics and independent samples t-tests were used to analyze the data. The study aimed to determine the statistical significance of project-based seamless learning's effect on concept understanding by comparing students' project competency scores. Prior to these analyses, normality and homogeneity tests were conducted to ensure that parametric assumptions were met." <p>Example 2 (Word Choice):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original: "This design evaluates the differences between two groups empirically." Improved: "This design employs an empirical comparison of the two groups." (More formal and precise) <p>Example 3 (Grammar and Punctuation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original: "Based on table 1, the normality test results on the experimental group pretest obtained a significance value of 0.103, on the control group pretest obtained a significance value of 0.106." Improved: "Table 1 shows that the normality test yielded significance values of 0.103 and 0.106 for the experimental and control group pretests, respectively." (Clearer, more concise, and grammatically correct) <p>Example 4 (Style and Tone):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original: "The results of the study were pretty good and show that the project-based learning model is effective." Improved: "The results provide strong evidence supporting the efficacy of the project-based seamless learning model in enhancing concept understanding." (More formal, objective, and avoids informal language like "pretty good") <p>These examples demonstrate how minor revisions in sentence structure, word choice, grammar, and tone can significantly improve the clarity, precision, and overall scholarly quality of the manuscript. A comprehensive edit would address these issues throughout the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sabah Abdalla Abdelazeem Elsayed</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Dhofar University, Oman</p>