

# Review of: "Fishing Rods for Magic: Theatre Forum Tools to Support Primary School Students' Active Engagement in Computer-Supported Collaborative Storytelling"

Fitri Suraya Mohamad<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Congratulations on writing about how Collaborative Learning through Storytelling could help Primary school students learn essential skills for their future undertakings. I enjoyed reading this article, but i have a few suggestions for improvement.

1. The initial part of the paper suggests that it would discuss/present ideas about how theatre forum tools (as a technology to support collaboration) would support active engagement. However in the content, it is unclear how the idea of active engagement is developed and supported, through use of technology (computer support). The active passive levels are determined by levels (as seen in segment 4) but if there is a concern about Active Engagement, it should not just focus on detecting which level of participation the students are at.
2. I was looking for the elements of the suggested tool which would address "special needs"; however there was none.
3. There is a mention of "Inclusive Education", but it was not established clearly in the paper. The challenges about creating and developing tools for Inclusivity should be described early on in the paper, to help readers understand the need for the investigation, and the solution. Should this be included as a keyword?
4. Is there any data collected, to explain how the suggested tools were used? It would have been useful to see how the suggested ideas/tools were utilised with actual students. The current version suggest a proposal stage study, rather than one that has been tested and analysed.
5. Discussion Tagging - it was indicated that the tool would "structure critical thinking and themes in CSCS". However it was unclear how primary school students would be facilitated and supported through the tool, to enable their critical thinking skills to be developed. What are the ages of the intended group of students?
6. There are a few grammatical and spelling mistakes in the writing. It would be good if you can send the article for a proofread before submission.
7. The figures in the paper were wrongly labelled as well.
8. There is a mention about "Collaborative Learning Structure", but the discussion was not developed sufficiently. It would have been useful to know how the CLS was designed using these proposed tools, so the focus is not about the technology, but on the actual learning experience itself.
9. The references - some are incomplete, and some are a bit outdated.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. All the best with the next phase of publishing.

