

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117769
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Assurance Practices in Open and Distance Learning Mode at the Institute of Adult Education, Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of quality assurance in Open and Distance Learning (ODL). With the increasing reliance on ODL for higher education, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, understanding and improving quality assurance mechanisms is essential. This research provides a comprehensive analysis of stakeholders' perceptions and the challenges faced in implementing quality assurance in ODL, offering valuable insights and practical recommendations for educational institutions, policymakers, and quality assurance bodies. Its findings contribute to the existing body of knowledge and highlight areas for future research, thereby supporting the ongoing enhancement of ODL programs globally.</p> <p>The title of the article, while descriptive, could be more specific to better reflect the content and focus of the study. An alternative title could be:</p> <p>"Perceptions and Challenges of Quality Assurance in Open and Distance Learning: Insights from a Higher Education Institution"</p> <p>This title clearly indicates the main themes of the research—perceptions, challenges, and quality assurance in the context of ODL—and makes it more appealing and informative to potential readers.</p> <p>The abstract of the article provides a general overview of the study, but it could be improved for better comprehensiveness and clarity. Specifically, it should include the following elements more explicitly:</p> <p>Background and Purpose: Briefly describe the context and the main objective of the study. Methods: Summarize the methodology, including the sample size, data collection methods, and analytical approach. Key Findings: Highlight the most significant results from both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Conclusion: Clearly state the main conclusions and any recommendations based on the findings.</p> <p>The manuscript's subsections and structure generally follow a logical progression, starting with an introduction and then proceeding to methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, there are some aspects that could be improved for clarity and coherence:</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction provides a good overview of the study's background and objectives. However, it could be strengthened by clearly stating the research questions or hypotheses to guide the investigation.</p> <p>Methods: The methods section adequately describes the data collection procedures and analysis techniques used in the study. However, it would be beneficial to provide more detail on how the questionnaire and interview guide were developed and validated, as well as how the sample size was determined.</p> <p>Results: The results section presents the findings of the study in a clear and organized manner,</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>with tables to summarize the demographic details and respondents' perceptions. However, it would be helpful to include more descriptive statistics and provide a more detailed explanation of the quantitative and qualitative findings.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion section provides an insightful interpretation of the results and relates them to existing literature. However, it could be strengthened by further exploring the implications of the findings for theory, practice, and future research. Additionally, providing a more critical analysis of the limitations of the study would enhance the discussion.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion provides a concise summary of the study's main findings and implications. However, it could be improved by offering more specific recommendations for stakeholders and policymakers based on the research findings.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of its methodology, data analysis, and interpretation of results. However, there are some areas where clarification or additional information would strengthen the scientific rigor of the study:</p> <p>Validity and Reliability: The manuscript briefly mentions the pretesting of the questionnaire and peer review of the interview guide for validity and reliability, which is essential for ensuring the trustworthiness of the data. However, providing more detail on the specific measures taken to establish validity and reliability would enhance transparency and confidence in the study findings.</p> <p>Data Analysis: The manuscript describes the analysis of quantitative data using frequency and percentage calculations, which is appropriate for summarizing categorical variables. However, it would be beneficial to include information on any statistical tests or measures of association used to analyze relationships between variables, especially in the discussion of research questions.</p> <p>Interpretation of Results: While the interpretation of results appears sound, providing more contextual information or theoretical frameworks to support the interpretation would strengthen the scientific validity of the findings. Additionally, discussing potential alternative explanations for the results and addressing any limitations in the study design or data collection process would enhance the credibility of the conclusions.</p> <p>The references provided in the manuscript cover a range of relevant literature on quality assurance in open and distance learning (ODL), which is commendable. However, to strengthen the manuscript's scholarly foundation and ensure comprehensiveness, please add more references.</p> <p>Title and Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The abstract provides a good overview but could be more concise. Ensure it highlights the key findings, methodologies, and implications of the study. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revise the title for specificity.• Refine the abstract to include concise details about the methodology, key findings, and implications. <p>Introduction</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The introduction is well-written and provides a solid background on the	
---	--	--

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>importance of quality assurance in ODL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• However, it lacks a clear statement of the research objectives and questions. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include a clear statement of the research objectives and questions at the end of the introduction.• Highlight the significance of this study in filling existing gaps in the literature. <p>Literature Review</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The literature review is comprehensive but somewhat descriptive.• It could benefit from a more critical analysis of the existing studies and identification of gaps that this research aims to address. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide a more critical analysis of the literature.• Clearly identify gaps in the existing research and how this study aims to address them. <p>Methodology</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The methodology section is clear but lacks detailed information on the criteria for selecting studies and the process of data analysis.• There is no mention of any framework or guidelines followed for the systematic review. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide detailed criteria for the selection of studies included in the review.• Explain the process of data extraction and analysis.• Mention any frameworks or guidelines followed, such as PRISMA, to ensure transparency and replicability. <p>Results</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results section presents the findings clearly but lacks depth in the discussion of the results.• There are some redundant points that could be streamlined. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide a deeper discussion of the results, highlighting significant patterns and their implications.• Streamline the presentation of results to avoid redundancy. <p>Discussion</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The discussion section adequately interprets the findings but could benefit from linking them back to the research questions and objectives.• The practical implications and recommendations are not thoroughly explored. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure the discussion clearly links back to the research questions and objectives.• Explore the practical implications of the findings in greater depth.• Provide actionable recommendations for policymakers, practitioners, and future researchers. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The conclusion summarizes the findings but is somewhat repetitive.• It does not clearly state the limitations of the study or future research directions. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Refine the conclusion to avoid repetition and clearly summarize the key findings.• Discuss the limitations of the study and suggest directions for future research. <p>References</p> <p>Comments:</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references are relevant and up-to-date. • However, ensure consistency in the citation format. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double-check the references for formatting consistency and adherence to the journal's guidelines. <p>Overall Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is well-structured and provides valuable insights into quality assurance in ODL. • However, it could be improved by addressing the above-mentioned points to enhance clarity, depth, and coherence. <p>Final Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the title and abstract for clarity and conciseness. • Include clear research objectives and questions in the introduction. • Provide a more critical and analytical literature review. • Detail the methodology, including selection criteria and data analysis processes. • Deepen the discussion of results, linking them back to the research questions and practical implications. • Clearly state limitations and future research directions in the conclusion. • Ensure consistency in reference formatting. <p>By addressing these points, the manuscript will be significantly improved and provide a more robust contribution to the field of quality assurance in open and distance learning.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript demonstrates a good command of academic writing conventions and maintains clarity throughout. However, there are a few areas where language and expression could be further refined for improved readability and precision:</p> <p>Sentence Structure: Some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified for clarity. Ensuring that sentences are clear and concise will enhance readability, especially for readers who may not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: While the manuscript is largely grammatically correct, attention to minor grammatical errors and syntax inconsistencies would enhance the overall quality. Proofreading for consistent verb tense usage and subject-verb agreement is recommended.</p> <p>Academic Tone: Maintaining a consistently formal and academic tone is important in scholarly writing. Avoiding colloquial expressions and ensuring all statements are appropriately referenced will strengthen the professionalism of the manuscript.</p> <p>Clarity and Precision: Aim for clarity and precision in expressing ideas. Avoid ambiguity and ensure that each statement contributes directly to the overall argument or findings of the study.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Louie P. Gula
Department, University & Country	Institute of Human Kinetics, Visayas State University, Philippines