

# Review of: "Profile and scientific nature of pedagogy"

Mingyu Li

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Firstly, it is a great honor to have the opportunity to communicate with scholars. The viewpoint mentioned in the article that education is ubiquitous has left a deep impression on me and I deeply agree with it. In this article, I will discuss my own experiences and feelings from the perspective of science education.

I agree with some normative issues mentioned by other scholars, such as the international citation range of references and overly emotional expressions, which need further revision. We will not elaborate on them here. In addition, I would like to add a few additional points:

1. I believe that the scientific essence of education is not the same as that of science. For example, the research objects of the two are different. The research object of education is people, while the research object of science is the natural world. This can lead to differences in many aspects between the two, such as in measurement, where there is always darkness or error in measurements related to education. In terms of scientific measurement, it is relatively accurate or precise. Furthermore, there may be significant differences in the evaluation of measurement data between the two.

2. In terms of keyword expression in this article, I believe it can be further focused. The current keywords do not serve the research topic well, including issues such as the need to strengthen the consistency between the paper title and the main text. Other scholars have already expressed this in their comments, and I will not elaborate further.

3. From the perspective of science educators, the current text needs to be further concise, and the current wording is somewhat redundant.

4. Regarding some academic viewpoints mentioned in the article that I do not agree with, such as Piaget's views, I hold a reserved attitude. At the same time, I personally believe that the impact of the environment on people is not limited, but rather significant. And some previous experience or knowledge of the research object should be a key consideration in education.

5. In the second part, the opening part still places too much emphasis on the object of education, while some overlook the subjective initiative of the educated and the interaction between the subject and object.

6. In this section, some of the following content only focuses on the formation of personality, and I personally believe that the role of education is too limited here.

Next, there is a question that I believe needs to be addressed. Some conceptual knowledge, such as the definition of educational action and the definition of the education system mentioned in the final section, needs to be clearly defined.

7. At the end of the second part, the viewpoint on education is mentioned, such as that the impact of education is indirect and does not directly affect individuals. 8. The role of classroom education may be overlooked here, and the importance of classroom education seems to be recognized later. There are also some such statements in the text, and it is recommended to carefully search and improve them to avoid conflicts and misunderstandings.

9. In the third part, the description of the relationship between pedagogy and psychology, sociology and philosophy is too fragmented. After all, there are many interdisciplinary research achievements in the academic world, such as educational psychology, educational philosophy, etc., which to some extent indicates that the boundaries between disciplines are not completely clear.

10. In the fourth part, the beginning emphasizes the importance of the previous foundation, which contradicts the opposing views held in the previous text.

11. In the fifth part, the viewpoints discussed here, such as the insufficient application of educational science theory in school teaching and the somewhat subjective way of expression, are suggested to provide examples or prove them from the perspective of the concepts and principles that support this argument, which may be more explanatory.

12. In the fifth part, the expression of the second subheading seems somewhat difficult to understand. It is possible to consider changing the expression to achieve a clearer writing effect.

13. Many viewpoints in the article can be sorted out and divided into several points, which may be more organized and easier for readers to understand.

14. In this section, the necessity of implementing educational experimental research has been mentioned. Currently, the results of educational experimental research are relatively rich. Therefore, whether this description is reasonable can be considered.

15. In the third paragraph of this section, the position of the research question is somewhat inappropriate. It is suggested to reorganize the writing logic of the entire text. Moreover, the positions at the beginning and end of each paragraph can highlight the main points contained in each paragraph, which may be easier to read clearly.

16. Finally, as the last paragraph of this article, the current content does not seem to have had a good effect in summarizing the entire text and strengthening the main idea of the problem.