

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124469
Title of the Manuscript:	Transforming Perceptions: Strategies for Making Computer Science Accessible and Engaging for All Learners
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>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is significant to the scientific community because it presents a timeliness concern related to accessibility and inclusivity in computer science education, an area that plays an important role in fostering technological advancement and innovation. By considering the challenges faced by underrepresented populations and proposing strategies to improve access and engagement, the research provides meaningful guidance to educators and policymakers aimed at recruiting a more diverse workforce. The use of a mixed-methods approach adds to the trustworthiness of the findings and strongly justifies the use of innovative pedagogical approaches. Overall, I commend the manuscript for its thorough analysis of an important issue, and for making an opportunity to stronger educational practices as well as better participation in computer science education.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "Transforming perceptions: Strategies for making computer science, accessible, and engaging for all learners," is an appropriate title because it focuses on a changing perception and strategies for inclusion in computer science education. It could be improved by being clearer and more concise.</p> <p>Alternative Title Suggestion "Enhancing inclusivity in computer science: Strategies to transform perceptions and engage diverse learners," recognizes the goal of inclusivity and the goal of transforming perceptions while retaining the overall message.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article provides sufficient detail in regard to the study aims, methods, findings, and implications. However, there are a few adjustments that may be made to enhance clarity and impact:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make Study Objectives Clear: Make the primary research question or hypothesis an explicit statement, so participants know the study aims from the start. 2. Emphasize the Key Findings: The abstract mentions challenges and interventions, but further elaboration regarding engaging students and performing better may corroborate the efficacy of the interventions. 3. Extend the Impact Statement: Extend the implications for educators, policymakers, and stakeholders to add more emphasis to the impact statement section for readers' attention to the broader context than may apply to the field. <p>These changes will improve clarity and make a greater impact in the abstract, ultimately making it better at informing readers.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and well-organized. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistent Formatting: Ensure consistent formatting for headings and subheadings throughout the manuscript to enhance readability. 2. Integration of Findings: Consider integrating the discussion of findings more closely with the results to provide a cohesive narrative, rather than treating them as separate sections. 3. Summary of Key Points: A brief summary or key takeaways at the end of each main section could reinforce the main ideas and facilitate comprehension. <p>Overall, the manuscript's structure is sound, but these adjustments could improve clarity and</p>	

Review Form 3

	reader engagement.	
<p>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 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This scientific manuscript demonstrates a combination of both rigor and thoroughness through a mixed-methods paper utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data to deepen understanding of the barriers students encounter when entering different roles in computer science education. Relying on surveys, interviews, and case studies, this research rigorously investigated experience and experiences to deepen the validity of the outcomes. Literature reviewed alongside the research was done in a way that related findings to other research, allowing readers to see and understand the size and scope of problems, such as stereotypes and gender gaps, that have been discussed doubts alongside studies in the field. Furthermore, useful suggestions were provided from the data, highlighting the technical aspects of the study. This is a good manuscript that contributes to understanding challenges in CS education and I'm sure can be applied in similar contexts.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references for the manuscript are reasonable, with a mixture of historical and current studies that address the topics of diversity and access in CS education. That said, some of the references are a few years old, and as the fields of technology and education are rapidly changing, some of the findings may have less relevance.</p> <p>I recommend enhancing the manuscript by including a couple of more recent studies in the past couple of years focused around innovative pedagogies, gender-equity in STEM, and technology use in learning outcomes, etc. Below are a few studies as examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Margolis, J., & Fisher, A. (2021). "Unlocking the Clubhouse: Women in Computing." MIT Press. 2. Beck, M., & Chisholm, A. (2022). "Engaging Underrepresented Students in Computer Science: A Review of Current Practices." *Journal of Computer Science Education.* 3. Papert, S., & Harel, I. (2023). "Constructionism: Research Reports and Essays." MIT Press. <p>In summary, including these more advanced references can help to strengthen the relevance and impact of the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's language and quality of English is generally appropriate for an academic audience for this manuscript, appropriate in academic tone, terminology support discussion, and gives clear, coherent statements.</p> <p>In conclusion, there are suggestions to improve clarity and, at times, conciseness such as removing overly complex sentences or jargon for the potential diverse audience of readers yet the glossary of terms is a strong, distinctive feature. Review consistency in terminology and flow of ideas in a logical manner would improve reader-ability. Overall, with clarity and conciseness edits the manuscript will be suitable for academic standards.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Organization and Clarity: The current organization of the manuscript is clear (as it is structured), but perhaps just a more pronounced transition between the sections (e.g. a transition statement or sentence) would demonstrate a connection to the points that were made in the previously presented sections.</p> <p>2. Addressing Current Trends: The authors have thoroughly represented significant barriers regarding diversity in Computer Science (CS) education, but the paper would be much richer if they turned into consideration onboarding discussions tying the themes together (e.g. the intersection of artificial intelligence and diversity or online platforms with student implication perspectives).</p> <p>3. Tables and or figures: Presenting a table or figure that summarized key findings would be beneficial and integrate visual aspect to aid comprehension.</p> <p>4. Future Research: One brief section on future research directions could be more potentially beneficial. Highlighting the gaps in research so that invites future into improving diversity and access to the field through research would certainly add action out of the research.</p> <p>5. Practical Implications: Practical implications for educators and policy makers would add value - if practical considerations are made clear, the practicalities of the research is then significant and invoke more action (dynamism) into the research.</p> <p>Overall, this manuscript and paper has significant value add to the research community and will potentially impact computer science education.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Tamanna Quraishi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of the People, Afghanistan</p>