



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_53143</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Teaching Methods and Creativity Levels of Students on Acquisition of Entrepreneurial Skills in the Rewinding of Coil in Electric Motor</b>
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>After reading the paper I feel that the manuscript is of potential interest to the readership of this journal, but there are major issues that must be addressed before the article could be published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/ * The literature review should be more carefully synthesised and structured. The use of sub-headings and signposting would help the reader to follow the argument being developed through the paper.</li> <li>/ * The results section requires far greater organisation and structuring. The analysis is too general, and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed.</li> <li>/ * Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive.</li> <li>/ * The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge.</li> <li>/ * Research methodology based on research goals is poor on absent.</li> <li>/ * The research/evaluation methodology is not justified, clear and appropriate (including ethical considerations / approval where appropriate)</li> <li>/ * More recent bibliography is necessary. Furthermore, the reference list is a little bit weak. Before I can make a final decision on the paper, please refer to more references and upload a new version. It is suggested that the author(s) can consider the following papers related to creativity, etc. to strengthen the background and conclusions of the study:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Papadakis, S. (2016). Creativity and innovation in European education. Ten years eTwinning. Past, present and the future. <i>International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning</i>, 8(3-4), 279-296.</li> <li>• Papadakis, S. (2018). Evaluating pre-service teachers' acceptance of mobile devices with regards to their age and gender: a case study in Greece. <i>International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation</i>, 12(4), 336-352.</li> <li>• Kalogiannakis, M., &amp; Papadakis, S. (2019). Evaluating pre-service kindergarten teachers' intention to adopt and use tablets into teaching practice for natural sciences. <i>International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation</i>, 13(1), 113-127.</li> <li>• Kalogiannakis, M., &amp; Papadakis, St. (2007). The dual form of further education of educators in ICT: technological and pedagogical training. In C. Constantinou, Z. Zacharias &amp; M. Papaevripidou (Eds.) <i>Proceedings of the 8th International Conference On Computer Based Learning in Science</i>, Heraklion, 30 June - 6 July 2007, 265-276.</li> </ul> </li> <li>/ * The academic writing needs work.</li> <li>/ * The discussion should be more concise and the outcomes should be discussed in relation to the existing research. The language style of this section has to improve.</li> <li>/ * Recommendations should also be given for practice and further research.</li> <li>/ * In preparing a revised manuscript, please also include a table of</li> </ul>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>how you have responded to each of the issues listed above point by point. I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript in the near future.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Papadakis Stamatios</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Crete, Greece</b>