



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

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

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

	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	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.	
<u>Minor</u> 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. On line 63, the author needs to present that sentence more clearly starting with "Educators were therefore..."	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer