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|  | 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | An interesting topic that seeks to examine online learning platforms. The paper has attempted to identify the challenges and difficulties faced by students when using the online learning platform in the perspective of proposing recommendations and strategies for enhancing the effectiveness of the online learning platforms.  A relevant research that may contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the online learning experience and outcomes for students if well conducted. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title of the paper is appropriate. |  |
| 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 needs to be further edited in a way to cover all the key elements required for a good abstract.  Such elements include:   * The reason(s) for the choice of the topic, * The research objective(s), * The research theory, * The research method(s) * The main findings.   So, the author needs to further edit the abstract following the aforementioned observations. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate and raise serious readability problems. As a matter of fact, the introduction needs to be further edited in a way to cover all the required key elements of a good introduction. Actually, a good introduction consists of key elements namely:   * a relevant preamble, * problem statement, (to be further relevantly stated) * a thesis statement, * a brief account of the theory (that is missing in the introduction), * the objectives, (to be reorganized without sub-heading) * the research questions (that is missing in this work), * the hypotheses (that is missing in this work. at least two hypotheses in line with the research questions are required), * the planning (that is missing in the introduction).   The paper is confusing:   * What do **2.1 Findings and analysis, 2.2 CONCLUSION** stand for in a literature review? * What does the phrase ‘In this chapter’ stand for in section **3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK?**   On the other hand, the author needs to reorganise the sections or subsections of the whole paper in a way to have clear and concise sections:  Suggested structure  Abstract   1. Introduction (without any sub-section. The key elements are structured in different cohesive and coherent paragraphs) 2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework 3. Methodology 4. Data Analysis 5. Discussion of the Findings and Suggestions 6. Conclusion   References  It is essential to note that the conclusion provided by the author is too short: 4 sentences!  A good conclusion should cover the following elements:   * restated thesis, * summary of the key findings, * closing sentences/paragraph, * perspective for future research. |  |
| **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.** | The manuscript is to some extent scientifically correct as it emphasizes the current issues of online learning platforms.  It is not scientifically robust because the study follows no theoretical orientations. It is crucial to adopt a learning theory for the assessment of online learning platforms. There are so many prominent theories that the author can use to examine the online learning process so as to identify the challenges and difficulties faced by students.  The manuscript does not sound technically robust because important aspects namely the theoretical framework and the discussion of the findings are missing. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | Yes, they are. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, it is. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The researcher needs to further edit the whole work. |  |
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