

Paper: "Play-Based Learning: Conceptualization, Benefits, and Challenges of Its Implementation"

Submitted: 01 December 2023

Accepted: 13 June 2024 Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Daniel Jambo Ghirmai

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p30

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marion Mwangi

University of Nairobi Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Soufiane Er-Razine

Regional Center for Education and Training Profession, Morocco

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Marion Kirumba Mutwiri		
University/Country: Kenya		
Date Manuscript Received: 4/4/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/4/2024	
Manuscript Title: Play-Based Learning: Benefits and Challenges of its Implementation		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1232/23		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes  You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes		

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

The title seems incomplete because it has left out the PBL conceptualization or attitude. Suggested title: Play-Based Learning: Conceptualization or Attitude, Benefits, and Challenges of its Implementation.

#### 2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.

3

The abstract needs editing. The researcher needs to state the study before stating the region it is conducted. Include the theoretical framework, study design and tool of data analysis. State the constructive findings as well for the free-play. State those who stand to benefit from this study and the recommendations. Edit the typo learning on the keywords.

# 3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

5

There are very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.

#### 4. The study methods are explained clearly.

2

This section needs some work. The researcher does not clearly state the reason for using probability sampling of the pre-schools for the study. There is lack of clarity on the how participants were selected in their various categories, the relationship between the tool used and the theoretical framework Zonal Proximal Development (ZPD). The section lacks clarity on the procedure of data collection, tool used for analysis and creative ways of presenting the thematic using (quotation banks or flow diagrams and mind maps or word clouds).

## 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

5

Yes, they are.

# 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

4

Yes they are, see the comments on the paper.

#### 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

3

There are a number of old references more than 10 years old. The researcher needs to replace or support the arguments grounded on these old references using more recent literature. This will show a continuous evolution of these concepts that are ever changing.

### **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This is a good study. Consider the comments presented in the paper. In addition, the ZPD theory presented in the paper seems to explain guided play while the free-play has not been explained by any theory. The researcher needs to explain aspects of these theoretical frameworks in the ECCE curriculum if it was the tool used for data collection.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Errazine Soufiane			
University/Country: Regional Cer Profession/Morocco	ter for Education and Training		
Date Manuscript Received: 12/04/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/04/2024		
Manuscript Title: Play-Based Learning: Benefits and Challenges of its Implementation			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1232/23			
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes			
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>			
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes			

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4	
It will be good (but not necessary) to add the context. As the title incorporate the benefits and challenges, the first may be general but the challenges described are specific.		
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4	
Some affirmation must be presented carefully due to the limitation of the study (see the attached file)		
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4	
Check the punctuation. See the attached file.		
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5	
Clear		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3	
The results are clear, but the interpretation is not deep, most of it is a description of the results and many are repetitive.		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
Good		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
Check some in-text Citation. See the attached file.		

## **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Very interesting topic, it will be good to move for quantitative and more deep statistic analysis.

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**