

# Review of: "The Key to Academic Equity: A Detailed Review of EdChat's Strategies"

Abdullah Ayub Khan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract: Need Revision

Keywords: Good

Introduction: Average/Revised Please

Literature Review: Average

Data Set: Average

Methodology: Weak

Caption, Citations & Footnotes: Good

Pictures, graphs & Flowcharts: Average

Results: Weak

Conclusion: Average

Future Work: Poor

References: Average

----- Overall evaluation -----

Suggestion and Recommendation:

The authors present a technical research paper with relevant topic, proper research methodology and potentially good contribution to the field of studies.

The authors are encouraged to resubmit the paper with more clarity on presented performance assessment metrics with the selected relevant Case studies and possible application scenario with assessment metrics. The paper should be written in proper format, figures should fit within the text, use of font should be uniform in all paper, as well as references should be updated with most recent results.

Suggestion and Recommendation:

1. Authors may elaborate more on the novelty/contribution of their work and how it
2. Authors need to be specific about their problem statement and the scope of their research.
3. Abstract: elaborate more on the problem statement, findings, and contributions.
4. Introduction is not clear. Authors may contribute more towards this.  
contributes to the literature in the second last paragraph of the introduction clearly.
5. Thorough proofreading is recommended.
6. A few of the figures are taken from the sources and are not cited properly, either they may be cited properly with

permissions or may be removed/ redrawn.

7. The conclusion is not clear and needs revision and clarity and alignment with the abstract and title.

#### References:

1. Your references are not listed in good style, as citation style is different from one paper to other.
2. some of your references are not complete please check.
3. Some citations (references) created in wrong manner (Please follow journal's criteria).