

Review of: "Paulian Approach to Critical Thinking: Assessing an Intervention Program"

Noha Atta Elfadel¹

¹ Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of the Boolean Approach to Critical Thinking: Evaluation of the Intervention Program

- **The study is entirely good and** characterized with the novelty of its subject which is considered important nowadays in addition to being innovative. Critical thinking skills are one of the increasingly popular skills in the twenty-first century.

However, there are some suggestions that I think are useful to the researcher and may increase the quality of the study, including the following:

- Review the study linguistically by a language proofreading specialist, especially with regard to punctuation marks.
- The limitations of the study should be addressed in the discussion, as this helps to assess the validity of the results and their generalizability.
- Add an introduction to the study to clarify the study problem.
- Review the relevant literature on the subject of study in a clear way that enables the researcher to benefit from it in discussing the results.
- Adding more previous studies on the subject to enrich the study with various international experiences.
- **Study sample:** Sample selection procedures have not been clarified as it is a very limited sample which may lead to the likelihood of being biased.
- **Study tools:** Despite the variety of tools used in data collection, such as (unified test, situation test, case studies, focus group discussions, and descriptive feedback). However, information about how to evaluate the effectiveness of the program through pre- post tests are not detailed enough. For example, no information is provided about the type of tests used, calculate validity and reliability, or how results are recorded, or interpreted.
- **The methodology** needs further clarification, as it was mentioned that the curriculum used is a mixed curriculum, but there was no mention of the specific used curricula, and there was no clarification, or justifications for selecting this type of curriculum.
- **Study results:** need further clarification, and it is preferable to review them in the form of tables showing the statistical method used.
- **Discussion of results:** It is better to discuss the results of the study and link them to theoretical frameworks and previous studies relevant to the topic of the study that support the researcher's argument.
- **References:** Review the list of references with references in the body of the research where the mismatch was observed

