

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_127576
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploration and Practice of Blended Teaching in Computer Programming Practice Courses from the Perspective of Golden Courses
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing need to reform teaching methods in computer programming practice courses through blended learning, emphasizing high-level, innovative, and challenging approaches. I find this manuscript insightful as it provides a well-rounded strategy to address real-world issues in education, such as the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application. However, need to improvise in several parts such as writing structure, supporting references.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The article's title is suitable. However, a more concise title is preferred. It could be streamlined to highlight the core aspects, such as " <i>Blended Teaching in Computer Programming: A Golden Courses Framework.</i> "	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Overall, the abstract article is comprehensive, with a few suggestions: 1.Highlight Specific Results: Include specific quantitative outcomes, such as improvements in student performance or engagement, to provide more tangible evidence of the study's success. For example: "The proposed reforms resulted in an X% increase in student engagement and a Y% improvement in problem-solving abilities." 2.Simplify Technical Jargon: While the abstract is detailed, reducing technical terms such as "empower numerical intelligence" could improve clarity for a broader audience. 3.Condense Reform Measures: The list of proposed measures could be streamlined to focus on the most impactful ones, making the abstract more concise. 4.Future Implications: Add a sentence about potential broader applications of the approach or its scalability to other disciplines.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are unclear and not well structured. Suggestion: to be more structured please follow: 1. Introduction 2. Literature Review 3. Methodology 4. Results and Discussion 5. Conclusion and Implication Or refer to the journal guidelines.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4	Overall, this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it builds on established frameworks, such as the "Golden Courses" initiative and aligns with the latest educational trends, such as blended learning and AI integration. It systematically identifies existing gaps in computer programming education and proposes targeted reforms supported by theoretical and practical insights.	

Review Form 3

sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Lack of references, the author only lists a few references at the beginning. Most of the statements and quotations in the article are not supported by references. The writing of references is also inconsistent, some use APA format while others use IEEE format. Please refer to the article writing guidelines.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear explanations and appropriate academic terminology. However, there are a few areas that could benefit from refinement:</p> <p>Simplify Complex Phrasing: Some sentences are overly long and could be simplified for better readability. For instance, "empower numerical intelligence in smart environments to reshape the teaching process" could be rephrased as "use smart technologies to enhance the teaching process."</p> <p>Grammar and Word Choice: Minor grammatical issues and awkward phrasing could be polished. For example, replace "not fully consider the characteristics of computer practical courses and students' existing abilities" with "fail to account for the specific needs of programming courses and student skill levels."</p> <p>Consistency: Throughout the text, ensure consistent use of terms like "blended learning," "golden courses," and "intelligent teaching environments."</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hendri Pratama
Department, University & Country	Malaysia