



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57269

Title: MOTOR RESTLESSNESS AND SCHOOL LUNCHBOXES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN IBAGUÉ, COLOMBIA

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision✓.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-170

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript explores an important issue linking nutritional factors and motor restlessness in school contexts using a qualitative multiple-case approach. The topic is relevant and potentially valuable for educational psychology and school health; however, the manuscript requires substantial revision to meet IJAR standards.

The Introduction provides a strong contextual background, but the research gap is not clearly articulated. The novelty of the study in relation to existing literature remains implicit rather than explicitly justified.

The Literature Review includes relevant sources but remains largely descriptive. It lacks critical synthesis and does not sufficiently position the study within current scholarly debates.

The Methodology is generally appropriate, particularly the use of triangulation (observations, interviews, and photographic data). However, important details are missing, including clearer explanation of sampling procedures, participant characteristics, and strategies to ensure validity and reliability. Ethical considerations are also not addressed.

The Results section presents useful findings but lacks structure, comparative clarity, and sufficient empirical evidence (e.g., quotations, frequency

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

indicators). The analytical depth remains limited, and alignment with the stated analytical dimensions is inconsistent.

The Discussion, Contribution, and Conclusions section requires significant improvement. The discussion is not sufficiently connected to prior studies and lacks theoretical integration. The contribution of the study is not clearly articulated, and the conclusions are somewhat repetitive and unfocused. The absence of a limitations section is a notable weakness.

The References section requires technical revision. There are inconsistencies in formatting, incomplete entries, and potential issues with the reliability and accessibility of some sources. Standardization according to APA style is necessary.