Review of: "Open Minds: Efforts to Strengthen the Exploration of Human Intelligence Diversity"

Muhammad A Ghani[1]

1 Universiti Malaya

Potential competing interests: major correction

(a) Introduction

=> Most sentences are from scholars rather than the author, particularly those related to issues.

> For instance, "The impact of multiple intelligences on children's development and learning outcomes has been extensively examined in academic research (**Suarca et al., 2016).** Findings indicate that it is crucial to evaluate children based on their capabilities rather than their limitations, underscoring the significance of identifying and fostering their diverse intelligences. Moreover, employing the BCCT approach in instructional management has been proven to enhance multiple intelligences in children (**Mustajab et al., 2020**). This underscores the importance of pedagogical strategies in promoting and cultivating diverse intelligences among students. Additionally, mathematical logical intelligence has been identified as a predictor of mathematical learning outcomes, emphasizing the role of specific intelligence in academic achievement (**Estri & Ibrahim, 2021**). Hence, it is crucial to adapt teaching strategies to enhance specific intelligence in order to improve learning outcomes. Furthermore, research has examined the influence of emotional intelligence and interest in learning on mathematical achievement, revealing a correlation between emotional intelligence and academic performance (**Purnama, 2016).**
>
> => Suggestion: Revise this section's flow of discussion.
>
> > It is supposed to go from simple to complex, e.g., the starting discussion has to be the general idea and end with specific ones, as the aim of this research.
>
> (b) Methodology
>
> => Too brief until the research operational is a bit blurry.
>
> > Suggestion: Have such subtopics as (i) research design, (ii) population and sampling, (iii) instrument, and (iv) data analysis.
>
> => The strong statements are supposed to be supported by the related secondary data. For instance, the research design—the author did not inform this. E.g., meta-analysis? Systematic Literature Review?

(c) Findings

=> Due to the blurry methodology, this section seems like puzzlement on how the data were analysed .

(d) Discussion

=> This section is supposed to be in line with the research objectives.

(e) Others

=> Revise the research objectives that are supposed to be more specific.

> The one like the research aim.

=> The APA version 7.0 needs to be followed for tables, figures, and references.