



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	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. 1/ * 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. 2/ * Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive. 3/ * The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge. 4/* The Methodology lacked suitable detail. 5/* Methodology of the central work is exposed appropriately. 6/* Research methodology based on research goals is poor on absent. 7/* The language style of this section has to improve. 8/* Recommendations should also be given for practice and further research. 9/* The discussion should be more concise and the outcomes should be discussed in relation to the existing research 10/* 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 paper related to the group-based project to strengthen the background and conclusions of the study: Orfanakis, V., Papadakis, S., Kalogiannakis, M., Ampartzaki, M., & Vassilakis, K. (2016). Digital student conference platform implementation: the case study of the "research project" course. <i>Open Education - The Journal for Open and Distance Education and Educational Technology.Special Edition one "school distance education, 12(2)</i>, 5-23.10 11/* The academic writing needs work. 12/* In preparing a revised manuscript, please also include a table of how you have responded to each of the issues listed above point by point. <u>I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript in the near future.</u>	1 In the final discussion and conclusion a few additional comments have been written to show the overall interest of the whole approach, for the students and the teachers as a monitoring system that somehow complement the technical aspects of the competition. The contribution of the paper has been also highlighted in the abstract. 2 and 3 The objective of the discussion was to exhibit some of the patterns that appear, and how these generate a sort of observation tool at a relatively precise level of granularity. This should show the interest of the approach for both the students and the teachers and how the whole framework complements previous works by providing a relatively a relative precise framework both based on psychological and physical variables. It also appears that the approach might be also used in further work as a predictive system that can be proposed to the students and the teachers. Additional comments have been given in the discussion and conclusion accordingly. 4 Additional motivations for the choice of the psychological and physical variables have been given in section 5 6 The objective of the approach developed was to setup a psychological and physical observation system that not only provides a sort of monitoring environment to evaluate the impact of these variables on the students' and teams' performance, but also to provide to the students and teachers a self-learning system that show how the different teams perform in group-project and competition environment. 7 A revision of the language of the paper has been made to the best of our knowledge. 8 A few comments on further work have been developed in the final discussion and conclusion. 9 Additional statements have been made in the conclusion to outline the own contribution of this paper in relation to previous work 10 The reference suggested has been included in the introduction of the paper plus a few more references.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		