

Review of: "Cybernetic-Based Instruction: An Innovative Learning Model in the Digital Age"

Vacius Jusas¹

¹ Kaunas University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Citing in the abstract is not advised, since you cannot show a reference.
2. The abstract is too long. It contains too many generic statements.
3. "For a long period of time, the teacher has been at the center of the teaching style in medical education". Why just medical education?
4. "Cybernetic-Based Instruction (CBI) emerges as an innovative learning model that capitalizes on the advancements in technology and the principles of cybernetics (Yablonskaya, 2023)". Wrong reference. The mentioned reference does not contain such a term as "Cybernetic-Based Instruction".
5. "This review paper explores the concept of CBI". The manuscript cannot be called a review paper, since it contains just 10 references. Usual research paper contains no less than 20 references Review papers usually contain 50 or more references. This manuscript just presents a concept of Cybernetic-Based Instruction.
6. "They learn better through visually enriched resources such as smartphones, computers, and the internet (Huang et al., 2020)". Wrong reference. The mentioned reference does not contain such a term as "visually".
7. "These traditional methods often lack interactions between teachers and learners and limit learners from actively thinking, thus leading to poor development of their cognitive abilities (Aruna & Thenmozhi, 2014; Huang et al., 2020)". Huang et al., 2020 cite other reference to confirm this statement. So, the original article must be cited.
8. "Lecture or the traditional method of learning is highly dependent on the knowledge base and skills of the teacher, requiring well-organized content preparation and good communication skills (Huang et al., 2020)". The reference contains no one of the following terms: "well-organized", "content preparation", "good communication skills". So, again, the reference is wrong.
9. Such a carelessly prepared manuscript cannot be considered for the publication.