



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_53452</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Relationship between Metacognitive Awareness and Reflective Learning of Medical Students at Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>After collecting reviewers comments I feel that 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/* The literature review should be more carefully synthesised and structured. The use of sub-headings and signposting would help the reader to follow the argument being developed through the paper.</li> <li>/* There does not appear to be an explicit theoretical framework. Currently the manuscript appears to be somewhat descriptive and a theoretical.</li> <li>/* 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.</li> <li>/* Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive.</li> <li>/* The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge.</li> <li>/* The Methodology lacked suitable detail.</li> <li>/* Methodology of the central work is exposed appropriately.</li> <li>/* Research methodology based on research goals is poor on absent.</li> <li>/* The research/evaluation methodology is not justified, clear and appropriate (including ethical considerations / approval where appropriate)</li> <li>/* The academic writing needs work.</li> <li>/* The discussion should be more concise and the outcomes should be discussed in relation to the existing research. The language style of this section has to improve.</li> <li>/* Recommendations should also be given for practice and further research.</li> <li>/* Some references within the paper body are not correct.</li> <li>/* The paper must be correctly formatted according the journal format</li> <li>/* 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.</li> </ul> <p>I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript in the near future.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Papadakis Stamatios</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Crete, Greece</b>