

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128582
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTRODUCTION FORMATS IN ESSAY WRITING: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the Article	

#### **PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><i>The abstract is a key element of a research article that can enhance the utility, discoverability and impact of the work presented. Implicitly, the quality and consistency of abstracts is vary substantial, and in this research, the state of abstract in the educational field has received little attention to date. In this sense, we examine the purpose, structure and future of the abstract in educational field research to provide advice on how to write a good and impactful abstract. Elements such as background, aim, methods, results and implications were found to be present in the relevant abstract, although there is room for improvement in clarity in some cases. Other elements, including research questions, hypotheses and future directions, are not often incorporated, indicating these elements may not be necessary in this context. These indications can be used by authors to structure an impactful abstract and also highlight elements (e.g., theoretical framework, sample size and context) that should be included to improve discoverability of published work.</i></p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p><i>Once aligned with the aims and scope of the journal, we are interested in whether a manuscript moves the conversation in the literature and the broader field forward. This is not always clear in manuscripts and, again, can be a straightforward issue to address. Some good advice is to state clearly and unambiguously somewhere in the manuscript (and preferably early on) exactly what the intended contribution is. Help reviewers conceptualize well; for example, “The contribution to existing research we make in this paper is ...” – this should not be too difficult, unless you do not know the field. Beyond the contribution not being clear, there are many instances we have seen of manuscript looking at issues that has long been comprehensively covered, left behind or that use outdated methods. We will discuss some of these problems in detail shortly. However, it is difficult to make an argument that you are contributing to the current state of the literature when you are entering the conversation as it has been in the (sometimes distant) past not where it is now. Similarly, it is hard to argue that you are moving the field forward if your work is based on ideas that have little to no evidence supporting them (see Lodge et al., 2022). If there is already a vast literature on the area you are working in, you need to make it very clear what your contribution is to the conversation in that area; yet, often this is not obvious in submitted manuscripts.</i></p> <p><i>The advice we would give here is to ensure you are as up to date as possible on the current state of the field. That means being on top of current theories, methodologies, methods and empirica l findings. Although it might seem obvious that it is unlikely we would be publishing work on bulletin boards (assuming they have not made a miraculous comeback between the time of writing and when you are reading this), it is common for manuscript to contain similarly outdated theories and research methods. We do not necessarily decline this paper simply because it might include some outdated ideas but including such ideas does not help make the case that the manuscript is moving the conversation forward.</i></p> <p><i>As we mentioned earlier, CE is a journal with an international focus. Manuscripts need to speak to a global audience of educational field researchers, practitioners and policymakers. We do not automatically decline papers that are situated within a specific niche context, country, institution or discipline. However, authors should attempt to explain what the implications of their research are beyond their own context, country, institution or discipline, as it should not be left up to editors, reviewers or readers to figure this out. Please explain clearly what your small- scale study tells us about the issue you have investigated beyond the context in which you carried out the study. When contextualising work for a broader audience, it is also important not to make a claim that your findings can be generalised without sufficient power in the study. This can be particularly tricky for qualitative studies where a core part of the research question(s) is specifically about understanding context and the experiences of people within that specific context. It is possible to help readers understand the wider meaning of your study without making a claim that the findings are generalisable to other settings. Perhaps the simplest way to do so is to make suggestions, rather than firm assertions, about transferability</i></p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><i>We all read and consume research article in our own ways. For some of us, including members of the editorial team or peer, reading the methods section is our starting point. The reasoning for this is that the methods section is supposed to give a clear sense of how the study was actually</i></p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>conducted. This is important for deciding whether or not the rest of the paper is worth reading. Getting the methods section right is vital for a publishable manuscript.</p> <p>The submitted paper to CE do not have anywhere near the level of detail required to give readers a sense of how the study was conducted. Sometimes, measures are not adequately described; in other cases, there is no sense of what students or participants actually did in the study. The most common errors are omissions of details about how the instruments used in a study were scored or how qualitative data were coded. Without this important detail, there is no way for a reader to be able to interpret the results section.</p> <p>As a rule of thumb, we recommend that authors provide enough detail in a methods section for an appropriately qualified and experienced reader to be able to replicate your study in their own context. This can be difficult as CE has a strict word count, and it may mean making other sections and sub-sections more concise. If there are insufficient details about protocols, scoring, coding, there is simply no way for a reader to understand what you did in your study. The rest of the paper is not going to matter if a reader cannot understand what you did in your research.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Incorrect reporting of results</b></p> <p>Inferential analysis of data, in particular, requires rigour. That is true for quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods studies. There are many fine resources available to assist with the analysis of data. Despite this, many manuscripts submitted to CE commit crimes against statistics. If you want to communicate clearly that you do not know what you are doing to an editor or reviewer, one of the best ways to do so is to report a p value as 0. Given that it is impossible to have a p value equal to zero and still be working within a probabilistic paradigm, it does not give readers a lot of confidence in the analysis of data when authors do this. Sadly, we receive many manuscripts where such fatal mistakes in reporting occur.</p> <p>There are long-established and constantly updated protocols for reporting quantitative and qualitative results. Authors are encouraged to draw on the vast body of resources to help with this reporting. A good starting point is the recommendations provided by the American Psychological Association, particularly given CE requires manuscripts to be formatted in alignment with APA style manual (7th edition) guidelines.</p> <p>CE is a high-impact journal with a focus on the use of educational fields in tertiary education. There is limited space for articles in the journal, and it has a wide audience. We are, therefore, only able to consider papers that are of relevance to our audience and that have the greatest potential for impact in the community. We are hopeful that the pitfalls outlined in this indication might prove to be useful for authors considering submitting to CE.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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><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 3

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Erfan Aslanyan-Rad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tabatabai University, Iran</b>