

**Paper: “The development of Critical Thinking Skills during Practical Training:
The Perspectives of Pedagogical Supervisors and Sports and Physical Education
Trainees”**

Submitted: 15 April 2024

Accepted: 05 June 2024

Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Georges Kpazai

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p113](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p113)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ezzeldin R. Aly
Florida A&M University, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

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

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

N/A

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

In the added document

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

In the added document

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

In the added document

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

In the added document

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

In the added document

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

In the added document

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

In the added document

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the added document

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is well-crafted, directly aligning with the manuscript's content and signaling the critical variables and the study's nature to the reader.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract details the methodologies and results to provide a comprehensive snapshot of the research. In addition, the abstract outlines the primary goals of the research, expanding on the methods and main results.

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

This manuscript is free from grammatical and spelling errors, demonstrating careful proofreading and attention to detail.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

While the study attempts to outline the methodologies used, the description lacks sufficient detail and clarity, making it difficult to fully comprehend the design and procedures. To improve, it would be beneficial to provide a more thorough explanation of the methods, including specific details about the controls, variables, and analysis used, ensuring that other researchers could potentially replicate the study.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Overall, the body of the paper is good. Results are presented clearly with a detailed explanation that supports the study's conclusions effectively.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are well-supported by the data presented, summarizing the key findings effectively and highlighting the study's contributions to the education field.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The literature review could be more thorough, updating it with references that more current.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript presents a promising start. However, to strengthen the foundation and credibility of the study, it is essential to expand and elaborate on the methodology section. Providing more detailed descriptions of the procedures, data collection methods, and analysis techniques would greatly enhance the clarity and reproducibility of the research. Additionally, the literature review could be broadened to include a wider array of relevant and recent references.

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the article was brief and free of complex words, and basic words indicating the field of research were used formulated taking into account the 4W rule (When, Who, Where, What).

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

With all our respect for the researcher's effort, the content has some shortcomings, please correct them

Rephrasing the summary of the article, focusing precisely on the research results reached without summarizing the generalities of the ideas

We point out that the researcher must highlight the research tools used and their content in collecting data.

With emphasis during the summary on the relationships and influences among the basic research variables

obs/

Review the introduction with an emphasis on : explains why this research is important or necessary or important. Begin by describing the problem or situation that motivates the research. Move to discussing the current state of research in the field; then reveal a “gap” or problem in the field. Finally, explain how the present research is a solution to that problem or gap. If the study has hypotheses, they are presented at the end of the introduction

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

The article does not have many typos or linguistic errors

The researchers are grateful for the effort put into writing the scientific article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The research tool used to collect data is not precisely clear and ambiguous in terms of content and in terms of the method of use in the field with the research sample. We also recorded ambiguity in terms of how to translate the raw results obtained
We also recorded the absence of similar modern scientific articles published in high-level scientific journals for researchers to use in interpreting the results of their research.

Accordingly, we advise researchers to make the stipulated amendments

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Indeed, the body of the paper is clear and organized and does not contain systematic errors

The article does not have many typos or linguistic errors

The researchers are grateful for the effort put into writing the scientific article

But the deficiency lies in the absence of statistical treatment in order to make objective judgments about the nature of statistical differences in the results of research samples.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

A very valuable and publishing work. But please enrich the discussion of the conclusion’s content with previous studies and similar research in terms of its agreement or inconsistency with the current research result.

Add websites to the articles used in the reference list

Clarification, within the theoretical background of the research topic, the justifications for this comparison between professors according to the scientific qualification variable

New research should be highlighted at the conclusion of the article

Finally, we must conclude: in a few lines, recall what has been demonstrated and the important messages that flow from it. It is good to open up concrete perspectives: what can be done with your work, to whom is it useful and under what conditions? Do

you have any prospects for implementation? Research work rarely closes a topic, but generally opens up new avenues.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Add websites to the articles listed in the current article

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Finally, we must conclude: in a few lines, recall what has been demonstrated and the important messages that flow from it. It is good to open up concrete perspectives: what can be done with your work, to whom is it useful and under what conditions? Do you have any prospects for implementation? Research work rarely closes a topic, but generally opens up new avenues.

Add websites to the articles listed in the current article
