

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_104780</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES IN DESIGNING BLENDED LEARNING INTEGRATED SOFT SKILLS IN HIGHER EDUCATION</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript furthers research on blended learning by taking a scientific approach to the problem.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is sufficient and conforms to most research standards.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, the subsections follow a standard research article.</b></p> <p>5. <b>There are sufficient citations validating the scientific methods applied in the manuscript.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes, the references are sufficient.</b></p> <p>Please check Figure 1 for typo. "Final Prototypea".</p> <p>The manuscript does not seem to follow the reference and citation standards set by the journal published at <a href="https://peerreviewcentral.com/index.php?page/general-guideline-for-authors">https://peerreviewcentral.com/index.php?page/general-guideline-for-authors</a></p> <p>The editor may want to deal with this with the author before the paper is accepted and published.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>John Jasina</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Clafin University, USA</b>