

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_108007
Title of the Manuscript:	Crafting E-Learning Pathways: A Student's Insight into 'Understanding Disciplines and School Subjects' in Teacher Education in Cuddalore district of Tamilnadu
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The abstract is in dire need of a complete overhaul. It fails to highlight the most crucial outcomes of the research adequately. The quantitative and qualitative sections should unequivocally feature the pivotal findings, and yet they remain buried beneath vague language and ineffective communication.</p> <p>The statement of the problem is outdated and lacks the necessary vigor for a contemporary research endeavor. The assertion that e-learning is no longer revolutionary is a gross oversimplification of the field.</p> <p>The so-called "innovation" of this study remains shrouded in ambiguity. There is a conspicuous absence of clarity regarding how this research builds upon prior studies or lays the groundwork for future investigations. The study fails to justify its significance convincingly.</p> <p>The paragraph critiquing related studies is cursory at best and offers little insight into the distinct role and innovation of this research.</p> <p>The excessive focus on previous studies without providing a meaningful analysis or critique is a glaring flaw in this work. It appears as if the authors have embarked on a literature review rather than an article, and the connections to relevant theories, models, and concepts are superficial at best.</p> <p>The disregard for the fundamental scientific structure is evident throughout the article, rendering it more reminiscent of a hastily extracted thesis than a well-crafted research paper. The lack of cohesion and organization is palpable.</p> <p>The use of the term "effectiveness of education" is not justified, and the failure to explore existing educational effectiveness models is a glaring omission. The study lacks depth in its engagement with established frameworks.</p> <p>The inclusion of two types of research goals without adequate rationale only serves to confuse readers and dilute the research's focus. The purpose behind this decision remains unclear.</p> <p>The sampling process, as well as the determination of sample size in both the quantitative and qualitative sections, is inadequately explained. The arbitrary selection of only four items out of 30 raises serious questions about the research's validity.</p> <p>The type of mixed research method used is left unspecified, leaving readers in the dark about the methodological approach taken in this study.</p> <p>The failure to report on the validity and reliability of the questionnaire used in the research is a glaring oversight, casting doubt on the credibility of the data collected.</p> <p>The choice of the content analysis method is not sufficiently justified, and the specific approach employed remains undisclosed. This lack of transparency undermines the methodological rigor of the research.</p> <p>The validation process for qualitative data is conspicuously absent from the study, leaving a significant gap in the research methodology.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The process of content analysis is poorly delineated, making it difficult for readers to understand how the data was analyzed and interpreted.</p> <p>The results are presented in a disorganized manner, lacking clear separation between qualitative, quantitative, and mixed sections. This lack of structure makes it challenging to discern the key findings.</p> <p>The results should be presented in alignment with the research questions, but this crucial alignment is notably absent from the article, causing confusion regarding the study's objectives.</p> <p>The discussion section requires a complete overhaul, with a more rigorous evaluation of the research's results in comparison to previous studies. The current discussion lacks depth and critical analysis.</p> <p>The limitations of the research are inadequately addressed, and the omission of research proposals for future studies is a missed opportunity to enhance the scholarly contribution of this work.</p> <p>The absence of policy recommendations based on the research results is a significant shortcoming, as it fails to translate the findings into actionable insights for policymakers and practitioners in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Keykha
Department, University & Country	Tehran University, Iran