



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_51184
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Jigsaw-Puzzle and Graphic Organizer Instructional Strategies on Biology Students' Performance in Abia State
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	<p>Since this study is quasi-experimental design, there will be better if just mentioned two groups in term of experimental group and control group only rather than three groups. Do revise sentences in line of 10 to 11, 142 to 143 and so on. However, author can elaborate that two groups were designed into experimental group.</p> <p>In line 52 to 54, strong statement “..the poor and inappropriate method adopted by Biology teachers during classroom instruction has led to the poor performance of students in external examinations.” needs to be supported with some researches in proofing the situation.</p> <p>Do check lines of 104 and 105, raw mean score of 31 for both years 2016 and 2017 were same. Why did author mentioned that performance of Biology students in 2017 was slightly poorer when compared to year 2016?</p> <p>In part of Methodology, do explain more details: a) Numbers of respondents in each experimental group and control group. b) How much time to be taken in teaching Biology using Jigsaw-Puzzle, graphic organizer instructional strategy and lecture method? c) Who were the instructors of Jigsaw-Puzzle and graphic organizer in this study? Give the reasons if author/researcher act as instructor. d) Time duration between pre and post test conducted.</p> <p>A reliability index of 0.75 that stated in Abstract was different with reliability index of 0.76 in line of 148. Do revise it.</p> <p>Try to make the number of “Table” in sequential. There were two “Table 1” mentioned in this manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In line 107, put capital letter for “table 1”. Write as “Table 1”. Do check all.</p> <p>Use past tense when reported pass years report such as in line 107, “...on table 1 is very poor.”</p> <p>In line 108, “Table 1.1” or “Table 1”? Do check.</p> <p>Does “SS1” (line 123) same as “SSS1” (in part of Abstract)? If not, do state the full name of “SS1”. If so, do match it with the correct term.</p> <p>In line 121, add “SSI” before “..students’ performance..”.in line with research questions.</p> <p>In line 120, use singular of “effects”.</p> <p>In line 127 & 129, use capital letter of “what”.</p> <p>Explain meaning or concept of “lecture method”. Does it means conventional method? If so, change the term to “conventional method” will be easier to understand by reader.</p> <p>Put up “A sum of” before “151 Senior Secondary one (SS1) Biology students...” in line of 144. Do not begin a sentence with a numeral.</p> <p>Do state the abbreviation of “JP”, “LM”, “GOIS”, and “MG” in full term.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>In line of 151, add “descriptive analysis” after word of “using”.</p> <p>In line of 213, end up the sentence with full stop.</p> <p>In line of 208 to 213, do discuss more in explaining the reasons why Jigsaw-Puzzle recorded high academic performance in the mean scores compared to conventional method or demonstration method.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript is well organized in writing. However, some corrections need to be done as mentioned in compulsory and minor comments. Methodology writing needs to be revised in details in giving clear understanding to readers.</p>	

PART 2:

	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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Liong Kon Thai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National University of Malaysia, Malaysia</i>