



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Education, Society &amp; Behavioural Science</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>2013_BJESBS_5177</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Learning Probability in the Arts Stream Classes: Do Colour Balls with STAD-Cooperative Learning help in Improving Students' Performance?</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research paper</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:**

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

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	I think the analysis would have been more appropriate if Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) had been employed to partial out the effect of the students' previous knowledge. The paired sample t-test cannot be used to attribute the difference in the post-test scores to the treatments.	<p>First of all, the reviewer is gratefully thanked for his/her constructive comments. Below are a few items which have been clarified/added to the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is best used to compare means of several groups (three or more) (Agresti &amp; Finlay, 1997).</p> <p>In this study, both CBCL and CL learning groups are essentially the same on the students' previous knowledge of probability (there is no significant difference between the two pretest means as has been stated on line 348-351), and neither group has been previously exposed to its treatment as mentioned on line 243-245). In regards to this matter, Gay &amp; Airasian stated that (2003, page 467), post-test scores are best compared using a t test.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	On Line 52, the author needs not write the university and published results. Only the name of the author and the year should be included or n.d. if it is not dated. Then the full description of the article can be spelt out on the reference section.	As stated on line 268 in SDI Paper template 2012, 'only published or accepted manuscripts should be included in the reference list'. Since the referred reference is an unpublished finding, so it is not be included in the reference list but mentioned in the text, complying with format requirements set by SDI as stated on line 270-271.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	On line 63, the author needs to present that sentence more clearly starting with “Educators were therefore...”	The section has been corrected and clarified as stated on Line 61-70.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		