

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_115772
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the Learning Style Preferences of ODL Students using VARK Model: Implications for Individualized Pedagogy and Student Success
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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This study investigates learning styles that benefit graduate students and professors in open-distance learning programs. This research on learning styles in ODL contributes to a more student-centered approach to education, potentially improving learning outcomes, satisfaction, and the overall success of ODL programs. 2. The title must be short. Here's the suggested title. "VARK and ODL Student Success: Tailoring Pedagogy for Diverse Learners" This title highlights the focus on ODL students and the link between learning styles and success. 3. The Abstract doesn't follow the standard format. I suggest eliminating unnecessary details: Remove the sections about Aims, Place and Duration, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion. Rephrase and condense: Focus on a concise and active voice. Combine sentences where possible and eliminate unnecessary words. For the structure, aim for three concise paragraphs with a maximum of 300 words that flow logically. 4. My review of the manuscript identified potential redundancy. Sections like "Rationale," "Research Questions," and "Purpose of the Study" could overlap with other parts, making the content repetitive for the reader. Consolidating these sections would enhance clarity and conciseness. 5. Upon reviewing the manuscript, I noticed it deviates from established scientific research formatting styles, such as APA. 6. Based on the publication dates, all references seem to be recent and relevant. No outdated references were identified during the review process. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The writing is clear and concise, with only a minor grammatical error that does not hinder comprehension.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noel A. Banca
Department, University & Country	College of Education, Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology, Philippines