



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_43622
Title of the Manuscript:	A Psychological Evaluation of a Competition-based Learning Environment
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 Expound more the methodology like on the aspects of but not limited to: ❖ Establish better validity and reliability of the chosen approach of the study including the research instruments used among others. ❖ Properly unlock variables like psychological physical state, expectations, investments, fitness, etc. 2 Provide more scholarly and in-depth discussions anchored from captured data, competition principles and structure, etc to establish better the suggested relationship between variables, role of psychological factors in relation to project-based teaching and learning. Doing so will present more candidly the true relevance of the paper in enriching the actual teaching and learning not just in engineering but in general. Likewise, take note, correlation cannot fundamentally establish "cause" and "effect" relationship. 3 Enrich the discussions based on quantitative results by adding salient qualitative findings (post-competition discussions). 4 If given the opportunity, it could have been decent to complement the perceptual measurements of variables like stress, fitness among others with more scientifically- or medically-oriented measurement procedures (e.g. aerobic fitness, BMI, flexibility, etc). 5 While discussions and/or statements/sentences should be made practically conclusive, it should be noted that that these should as well be cautious (not too strong or too general) and be based always from captured data and relevant findings. Please see once again the conclusions made especially on the aspects involving knowledge acquisition, collaboration skills, and teachers as proactive observers.	1 Additional explanations have been given at the end of Section 2 and start of Section 5 to further motivate the choice of the four variables selected. 2 A revision of the respective relations between the psychological and physical state variables and trends that appear has been made. Indeed thanks for remaining us on the correlation misleading comments often made in the final discussions, this has been modified. 3 A few more comments have been given in the final discussions and in the conclusion on the learning outcomes from both the teachers and students' points of view. The objective and contribution of the paper has been also clarified in the abstract 4 and 5 Further works have been discussed in the conclusion regarding possible extensions of the work as well as integration of additional variables. The final discussion and conclusion has been slightly edited to outline the learning outcomes as well as the contribution of the paper (taking into account both the students and teachers points of view). All changes in the paper have been highlighted in the revised version.
aMinor REVISION comments	• Language editing is highly suggested.	A revision of the paper has been made to the best of our knowledge.
Optional/General comments	• The paper is definitely promising and publishable after the essential revisions were made by the author.	Thank you very much for this encouraging and positive statement.