

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

Mauro Giacomazzi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Introduction and Literature Review:

The author effectively frames the problem related to nurturing critical thinking (CT) in the education system. However, it would be helpful to provide a clearer explanation for the choice of Paul's framework. In the literature review, it would be beneficial to briefly recap the main characteristics or steps of this method. Additionally, the authors should consider addressing the contextual implications of choosing a method that was developed and tested in a Western context.

Concerning references in the text, I am unsure about the chosen reference style. For instance, the statement, "It was remarked in the Education Commission (1964-66) of India, 'No system can rise above the status of its teacher...'," raises questions about whether "66" refers to a page number or something else. The reference format should be clarified.

The reference style in this format, "Paul et al., Everett, 1999;" seems unclear and needs clarification.

## Methodology:

It is advisable to include a brief description of the study's approach (Mixed Methods) and outline the designs of both the quantitative and qualitative components of the research.

The sample population, as well as the sampling size and strategy for both the quantitative and qualitative components, should be clearly defined. Readers need to understand who was included in the study and how they were selected.

The subheading "Focus Group Discussion" is somewhat misplaced after the data analysis process. It would be more appropriate to integrate it into the paragraph that describes the procedures followed in conducting the Focus Group Discussion (FGD).

## Findings:

For the quantitative data findings, consider adding a table that summarizes the results. This can provide a visual aid for readers to better understand the quantitative findings.

Presenting qualitative data based on the data collection strategy might be somewhat fragmented. It would be more cohesive to identify the main themes that emerged from all the qualitative data collected and present them based on these overarching themes, rather than the tools used for data collection.

## Discussion:

The discussion section could benefit from a more in-depth exploration of the findings. The author should consider comparing the results with similar findings in the literature and with the outcomes of similar studies in the same context, such as the three studies mentioned in the literature review or studies from other contexts.

Highlighting the differences between the study's context and other contexts would provide valuable insights. It can shed light on the unique factors influencing the study's outcomes and contribute to a more comprehensive discussion.