

Result of Review

Title: The actual title was removed

Author(s): The actual names were removed

Decision of Paper Selection

- Accept submission, no revisions required
- Accept submission, revisions required; please revise the paper according to comments
- Revise and resubmit for review
- Decline submission

What should you do? (For accepted papers)

- ✓ Revise the paper according to the comments (if applicable)
- ✓ All authors must agree on the publication, please inform us the agreement by E-mail.
- ✓ You have to pay a publication fee of 300.00USD for the paper.
 - ✧ Please find payment information at: www.ccsenet.org/payment
 - ✧ Please notify the editor when payment has been made

Proposed Schedule for Publication

- ✓ Vol. 1, No. 2, December 2012, if you meet above requirements within 2 weeks.
- ✓ You may also ask to publish the paper later, if you need more time for revision or payment.

Additional Information

- ✓ You will receive two copies (per paper) of printed journal, *free of charge*
- ✓ If you want to buy more printed journals, please contact with the Editor
- ✓ You may download e-journal in PDF from: www.ccsenet.org/jel/ *free of charge*
- ✓ Any questions please contact with the Editor at: jedp@ccsenet.org

Comments from Internal Editor

Evaluation	Grade
	Please fill a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 (high to low)
Overall evaluation on the paper	3
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and Readability	3
Soundness of methodology	2
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	3
Comments and Suggestions	
<p>(*) Re-edit the paper according to APA style and Paper Submission Guide</p> <p>() Picture(s)/figure(s) are not clear, 300 dpi is required</p> <p>(*) Move the footnotes to endnotes</p> <p>() Resize the table(s)/figure(s), to fit A4 paper size</p> <p>() Revise table(s) into three-line table(s)</p> <p>() Insert table(s) and figure(s) into the text, not after references</p> <p>() Similarity index (checked by iThenticate) is high, please revise to keep a Similarity Index $\leq 30\%$ and single source matches are not $>6\%$.</p> <p>(*) Add DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs, please see <i>Paper Submission Guide</i></p> <p>() Others:</p>	

Comments from External Reviewer

❖ Evaluation (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor	
Items	Grade
Contribution to existing knowledge	4
Organization and readability	3
Soundness of methodology	3
Evidence supports conclusion	3
Adequacy of literature review	2
❖ Strengths	
<p>This paper deals with a very important issue for professionals in higher education and teacher education, in particular. Although the sample is small, replies reveal not only interesting but also useful information regarding critical thinking in Saudi Arabia and perhaps other countries with similar educational conditions/characteristics. I believe that the researcher's decision to use focus-group interviews was a good one because it gave respondents the opportunity to express their thoughts and beliefs in their own words/terms.</p> <p>Another strength of the paper is that it gives readers a glimpse at how the cultural context influences (or not) the teaching and learning of critical thinking concepts and skills.</p>	
❖ Weaknesses	
<p>The weaknesses of this paper are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A very brief and superficial literature review that makes one wonder whether the author is at home with the subject. Richard Paul is a very important and influential "name" in the field of critical thinking but he is not the only one. Although other names appear in the "Findings and Discussion" section, only 3 references, from the 90s, appear in the "literature review". The author also needs to check for "statements" that are not supported by relevant references. For example in Section "2.2 <i>Critical thinking in pre-service teacher education</i>" we read <p style="margin-left: 40px;">"Critical thinking in teacher education is also becoming a relevant topic of study in non-European and North American countries such as Ghana. Owu-Ewie (2008)..."</p> 	

One reference from one study/country does not support the argument that “Critical thinking in teacher education is also becoming a relevant topic of study in non-European and North American countries such as Ghana” (Is that Ghana in West Africa?). More references are needed if this is the case.

2. At some points, the paper confuses the reader with contradictory statements. For example, on p. 5, we read that “According to students, several lecturers encouraged discussion”. In the next paragraph starting with “Arab Open University students...” we read “...students also articulated a desire for classroom discussion but as in King Abdul Aziz University, this rarely occurred”. Page 1 we read that “Theorists in the field advance various definitions of critical thinking”. At the end of the same paragraph we read that “a consensus of sorts on the definition of critical thinking has been arrived at”.
3. Perhaps the author could have their paper edited by someone who is fluent in English. (Examples include: “In Saudi Arabia, scholars such as Miziny (2010) and Al-Essa (2009) have been agitating for education reforms to incorporate critical thinking as a principal component in education”, “For secondary preservice teacher education students, critical thinking assumes greater importance because these students will be responsible for inculcating critical thinking among their own future students”, “Students’ requirements for acquiring critical thinking” etc.) I also suggest simpler word choice.
4. I think that a detailed check of the references is needed. APA style is not used accurately or consistently – neither in the text nor in the references section.
5. The “Findings and discussion” section needs better organization: The questions asked are not clear and subtitles are needed to make clear the categories or the key-themes that emerged from data analysis. Students’ answers are very interesting – it is a pity not to present them in a way that points out the significance of the study or the work that was, undoubtedly, done by the researcher-author.
6. There is no point in using terms such “the majority” or “most students” or “many students” in a sample of 12. Moreover, because of the small sample data interpretation must be tentative.

❖ **Suggestions to Author/s**

Please see the above comments. In a sentence: the paper needs to be re-organized in order to point out the importance of the findings.