

Review of: "Analyzing Students' Perceptions of Collaborative Tools for Automated Assessment of Programming Assignments in Distance Education"

Felix Estrella¹

¹ Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors, it is my honor to review your paper.

First off, it is necessary that you have a native speaker review the paper for grammar, spelling, and style, at the very least. When I read your paper, I could identify several issues with these three things. You could also run the paper through Grammarly or any other AI like that.

I am going to use a format I have for peer reviews, and then I will move on to make some general comments on the paper.

Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?

Not really. When making a query on Google Scholar, I got 57,600 results; of course, not all of them were 100% related, but still. I also did not find in the abstract, nor in any section of the paper, an indication of this research's originality, which is necessary to draft for your readers to understand why they should read your work.

Abstract:

Does the abstract relate to the article?

Yes, it does, although it requires a little more work to be much better. Try using a structured abstract where you have subheadings for your abstract. You don't really have to use the subheadings, but structure your abstract around them. So, these are the subheadings I am talking about: Purpose, Methodology, Findings, Originality, and Implications. By organizing your abstract this way, you make sure that all the information the reader needs is there. For example, the sentence about the goals of the experiment is extremely long and not necessary.

Does it provide an adequate summary of the content?

Not really. There is information on the statement of the problem, you wrote about the purpose of the paper, but there is no mention of the methodology. Are you using a quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods design? I can't tell because it is not in the abstract. You did write about the findings, but you did not mention why your research is worth reading.

Is the language easy to understand and clear for the reader?

There were moments when I found it hard to follow your train of thought because of several issues. First, there are many run-on sentences (sentences that are extremely long), and there were moments in which it seemed like even you guys were lost in the ideas that you wanted to get across. Second, there are sentences that don't make much sense and you need to re-write them so they are clearer. Third, try to avoid the use of jargon. Fourth, there are grammar issues like subject-verb agreement that need to be checked, and verb tenses as well.

Relationship to Literature:

Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources?

Yes, it does. It actually has a good range of papers, which gives me the idea of an adequate understanding of the issue with which the paper deals. There are a few old papers cited, but I can relate them to theories and information that sometimes it is better to go to older references. So, good job here.

Is any significant work ignored?:

I could not think of any bodies of research that had been ignored.

Methodology

Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas?

Yes, it is.

Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed?

I think your methodology section requires more work, especially in the organization of the subheadings of the section.

This section should be clearly divided into the following subsections:

1. Philosophical approach: (This section is not mandatory, but I always like to read it to see what makes you tick as a researcher). Anyway, here you should write about the paradigm that governs your paper, the ontological and epistemological stance before the research, and of course the methodological proposition.
2. Participants: You should always give a good demographic account of your participants to know who your subjects are.
3. Sampling scheme: Talk about what sampling design was used, the inclusion and exclusion parameters, and the sample size.
4. Research design
5. Data collection tools: Mention here what tools you used to collect data and what procedures were conducted to ensure the tools' validity and reliability.

Are the methods employed appropriate?

Yes, they are.

Results

Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately?

Yes, they are. Good job there.

Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

Yes, they do.

Practicality and/or Research Implications

Does the paper clearly identify any implications for practice and/or further research?

No. There are no implications of the findings provided by this study. It lacks an account of the societal and practical implications of the findings.

Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

There are no implications.

Quality of Communication

Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership?

In general terms, it does. However, there are issues such as clarity of the sentences and cohesion that need work.

Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms?

In general terms, it does. However, there are issues such as clarity, correctness, delivery, grammar, and spelling that need work.

Reviewer's comments:

1. The paper requires an exhaustive proofreading focusing on grammar and spelling, cohesion and coherence, clarity and correctness, and delivery. Without this proofreading, this paper will not pass any journal's peer review process.
2. Be careful with run-on sentences. I could see this is a very common issue in the paper. You have very long sentences which many times make the reader lose track of your train of thought.
3. Your introduction and literature review are OK, but come heading 3, Research Aims, I have a huge red flag here. This should be part of the introduction section; it should not be a stand-alone heading.
4. I already talked about the methodology and how it should go. Let me comment on how you have structured your

methodology section.

In the first paragraph, you start talking about the students, and then you move to the second paragraph and relate the approach you implemented. In the third paragraph, you again write about the participants of the study, which you already started discussing in the first paragraph.

Then you start talking about the experiment and how it was carried out. This section should be in the procedures subheading in the methodology section.

5. The first sentence of page 10, you again mention the participants and write "Initially, a number of Computer Science and Telecommunications Engineering groups were selected for the experiment. The total number of students enrolled in the course from both degrees was 271 students." That first sentence is an incomplete idea because you say "initially," which leads me to believe something happened and there were more participants.
6. Were the questionnaires used made by you, or did you adopt them from another study? This information is vital, and it is not mentioned. Furthermore, if the survey was made by you, what measures were taken to assure the survey's validity and reliability? This information is extremely important, and it is missing from the paper.
7. The data analysis section is used to relate what analyses were conducted on the data, nothing else. However, you are reporting the results of alpha, for example. That should go in the results section. Please check that only the analyses performed are related but do not talk about the results.
8. There are several places within the study where you have used bold typeface. I don't understand the meaning of that. Is that part of the journal's instructions? Or maybe they are typos?
9. Table 9 has highlighted four pieces of information in gray and three in yellow. Why is that?
10. I have the same question for Table 10. Although now you used green and light blue. Again, why? I don't see the need, and neither is it explained in the text.

I hope this review can help improve your paper. Should you have any questions about my comments, don't hesitate to contact me at destrell@espol.edu.ec