



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_13843
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF CONSTRUCTIVIST LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: GENDER AND SCHOOL TYPE DIFFERENCES IN SIAYA COUNTY, KENYA
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:

(<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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the literature review/introduction more recent work should be referenced (Tabler, 2010, 2011; Sjoberg, 2010.,etc). 2. Since research has been carried out on constructivist learning environment in relation to biology (Stewart, 2001; Ongowo, 2013; etc), a section/paragraph in the literature review/introduction related to them should be added. 3. In the methodology there should be a section explaining how quantitative and qualitative data was analysed. (Parts in Results and Discussion focusing on data analysis; lines 253-255 should be in Methodology). 4. More results related to the interviews carried out should be presented and related to the findings of the questionnaires. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interesting implications; they should be explained in more detail. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. After the research questions are presented (1.2), the authors could perhaps explain why this piece of work is important. 2. The authors do not need to re-state the research questions in the Results and Discussion just refer to them. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	United Kingdom