

Review of: "Transitioning to Hybrid Assessment: Reflections on Academic Assessment Practices Post-COVID-19"

Miguel Angel Cruz Pérez

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper. This is an interesting paper; however, I have a few observations to improve it.

INTRODUCTION

In the line "Berdi and other authors (2021)..." should be rephrased to make sense of the previous sentence.

The concept of assessment must be addressed related to the idea of education. It is mentioned abruptly with no clear connection to the previous idea of online education and sounds artificial when introduced as "First of all, online..."

The sentence "which proves, according to Yerly and Issaieva (2021)..." does not prove the previous idea. It would be better to use "aligned to what Yerly and Issaieva (2021) state about..."

The second paragraph mentions a paradigm not previously defined. A line or an idea connecting these two paragraphs would help.

The idea of hybrid assessment should be supported, not only mentioned. Also, the quality of assessments "carried out in person" should not be considered granted. Elaborating on this matter would help a lot.

Are the questions in the section the research questions? If so, they should be more aligned to the concepts used in the introduction: quality, quality gap between online and face-to-face, quality of hybrid assessments.

Include the importance of the research for the educational system.

Mention the objective(s) of the research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Hybrid assessment is not clear without the theoretical support of the introduction.

The line "hybrid assessment is an important step in hybrid teaching to improve the teaching-learning process" is not clear as it requires support from previous ideas in the paper. At the end of the paragraph, there is an interesting idea to use, and also it is not developed: continuous improvement.

There are some other ideas that are not developed, which makes the section unsubstantiated.

The clear distinction between evaluation and assessment could improve the idea of the paper.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In B. The levels of the hybrid evaluation scenario mention the term “evaluation,” and it was not defined previously.

In “A. Hybrid evaluation practices,” the last line of the paragraph repeats the word “This, this.”

“Summative face-to-face assessment through face-to-face supervision” - the comparison referred to should specify what is being compared. By doing so, the next paragraphs will be enriched, and well-organized paragraphs will contribute to the way in which Bloom’s taxonomy is applied.

“At the level technological” could sound better as “Technological level.”

In 3.3.2, when MCQ is mentioned, the meaning should be written.

Including the reliability of the measuring instrument will increase the impact of the paper.

RESULTS

The labeling of the hypotheses here should be aligned with the questions, and the hypotheses that were not previously stated.