



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_20367
Title of the Manuscript:	The effectiveness of the Mawhiba program for the development of critical thinking skills among gifted female students at the secondary levels
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Introduction i. Should start with current issues and studies related to critical thinking at global level, followed by issues in Saudi Arabia. ii. Introduction should be followed by: 1.1 Problem statement 1.2 Research objectives 1.3 Research questions iii. The objectives and the research questions must be parallel. 2 Literature review Literature review and theoretical framework are satisfactory. 3 Methodology Methodology is poorly written: i. Independent variables and dependent variables are not stated clearly. ii. What are Exploratory sample and Core sample ? These are not common terms used to describe the sample. iii. Selection of samples are not discussed clearly . The size of population is not mentioned at all. The number of students at intermediate and secondary level is not stated. The purpose of comparing their (intermediate and secondary students') critical	DONE



SDI Review Form 1.6

	thinking is also not justified. iv. The procedure of collecting the data is not clear. v. A pilot test should be carried out to obtain the validity and reliability of the instruments used in the study. v. The analysis of data using inferential statistics is not explained (using independent samples t-test or dependent samples t-test). 4. Findings and discussion i. Findings and discussion are not presented well. ii. Table 2 is not clear and confusing because there is no connection between the title and the content in the table. iii. Table 3A: The title should be – Paired samples t-test comparing the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test for critical thinking. iv. Table 3B;: Analysis of data in Table 3B cannot be accepted because the total number of students are only 30 (N=30). As such the number of students in each group will be less than 30, and the independent samples t-test t-test cannot be carried out if each group is less than 30 students.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript need many corrections before publication	