|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**](https://journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_AJESS\_131255** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Wikipedia and Teacher Education: Student Uses and Perspectives** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript is important because it helps us understand how future teachers use and think about Wikipedia. It shows that while many students rely on Wikipedia, they do not always check if the information is correct. The study also encourages teachers to help students develop better research skills and think more carefully about the sources they use.** | Thank you for this response. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is suitable for the article** |  |
| 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. | **The abstract is good, but lack some important information like sampling and data analysis procedures. Moreover, there are some issues related to the constructions and adherence with research report language. The suggestions were made in the article. E.g:**   1. **Purpose of the study, sample size and key findings are Ok.** 2. **Clearer research gap, methodology details should added** 3. **Some sentences should be revised for clarity and conciseness** | Additional descriptors have been added to the Abstract but not more extensive information to keep the Abstract to an appropriate length. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **The manuscript is scientifically sound and presents a well-researched study in line with the direction of the study, well-researched literature review, appropriate research design and logical interpretation of data.**  **However, some areas need to be improve the article. Eg:**   1. **The manuscript does not clearly explain how the questionnaire was developed or validated. I suggest you mention whether the survey was adapted from previous research or designed by the authors.** 2. **The statistical analysis used is descriptive. It would be beneficial to discuss whether any inferential tests.** 3. **It is crucial to cite the sources of some research based finding ad statistical data. Eg: The paper states that “Wikipedia appears on the first page of 99% of Google searches” but does not cite a source** 4. **There are some declinations in the result presentations Tales formatting. There is need to check ad use journal’s format ad APA guidelines.** 5. **Methodology of the study also lacks source** | The design and validation of the survey have been added.  1. No inferential statistical analyses were conducted. The use of descriptive data is clarified. 2. Citations have been checked and corrected throughout the paper. 3. All table layouts have been aligned with APA style. 4. Sources have been added to the research methodology section. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The references are sufficient for to back the paper, however, there is an observation that, some introductory sources are over 15 years old (e.g., Toffler, 1980; Read, 2006; Rector, 2008). On the other had recent development about Wikipedia I the last 5 years should be added. Also adhere with APA guidelines of referencing** | Additional recent references have been added (2020-2023). |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the manuscript is well written in academic language. However, proof reading is very important to limit grammatical typos where available. | Additional proofing and editing have been conducted. |
| Optional/General comments | **The manuscript is well-researched and relevant, but improving clarity in the abstract, detailing the methodology, refining wordiness and incorporating recent literature will enhance its impact and readability ad contribution to academic community.** | Thank you. Major portions of the paper have revised that I believe strengthen the work. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |