Review of: "Measuring the Effectiveness of Internship Programs in Aligning Education with Industry: A Comprehensive Analysis of Internship Outcomes in College of Communication and Media during Covid-19"

Giovanna Artioli[1]

1 University of Parma

Response to authors' review

In my opinion, the article is much improved and much more understandable. I think the revision work was very good. There are still some aspects that could be improved, which you can find below.

New review 24.01.2024

Abstract

Point 1 of the previous review: In the abstract, I would better specify the method used, the participants, and the main results.

Reviewer: I noticed that the suggestions for the abstract were picked up. The abstract looks much improved and more complete to me.

Introduction

Point 2 of the previous review: The introduction could be reorganized with a logical thread that starts from the general and goes to the particular on this topic, favoring the literature gap that we want to fill with this study. Still in the introduction, I would suggest updating the literature that is used (it would be good to use references from at least the last 10 years, preferably within the last 5 years).

Reviewer: The introduction was discreetly redesigned; however, the references have not been changed. It is very important to have updated references, within the last 5 years. Please update, with the exception of the core references.

Point 3 of the previous review: Table 1 is included in the introduction, but I imagine it is the series of questions that was used to obtain reports from the students. I would suggest moving these questions into the method and preferably using open questions (in qualitative research, closed questions with yes-no answers are rarely used).

Reviewer: Tab 1 has been moved to the methodology, and this is correct. But the questions within the table are still closed. In qualitative research, they should be open. For example: would you like to tell me how......

In addition, the methodology should be divided into data collection and data analysis. Tab 1 would go into the data collection.

<u>Methods</u>

Point 4 of the previous review:

There are some inconsistencies in the method:
first, you say that you conducted a content analysis on 20 students, then you declare that you analyzed the reports of all students (64). Why is this?
secondly, you declare that the method is qualitative, but then you count the words with software. This is okay for content analysis, but perhaps it is useful to explain better and not talk about themes and categories. Furthermore, the method lacks the approval part of a research ethics committee.

Reviewer: The methodology has improved, partly because the data analysis has been properly explained.

Point 5 of the previous review:

Results

The results are not easily understandable, especially those included in the table, while those in the figures are much clearer and well described.

Discussion

The discussion is completely missing; perhaps you have thought about replacing it with conclusions. However, I would suggest inserting something into the discussion, highlighting your main findings and comparing them with the literature already present.

Reviewer:

The problem of no discussion is not solved by putting the title results and discussions. The discussion continues to be missing. I suggest that results and discussion be subdivided again and, in the discussion, even in brief, include a comparison of the main results obtained and other relevant literature