

# Review of: "Comparative Analysis of Teacher Professional Development Models in Indian Higher Education: Implications for NEP Implementation"

Siamack Zahedi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I think the topic of your study is very important. I also appreciate the number of interviews you have undertaken - this must have taken quite a lot of effort! I do think the study has potential, but I think you need to address some very fundamental issues with the study design. For whatever it is worth, here are my suggestions: 1. The rationale and purpose of the study should ideally be presented in very precise and explicit terms in the Introduction section. I see you forming a problem statement in some sense in the intro, but you didn't follow it up with "and hence our study aims to ... (present what), in order to \_\_\_\_ (achieve what)". You share this in 2.2, but I think it should come in the intro. Also, tell us a little about the context of your study in the intro, i.e., who the participants were, etc. 2. You mention "there is a notable gap in the comparative analysis of various teacher professional development models within the context of India's New Education Policy (NEP) implementation," but I don't know what that means. 3. The lit review (a) just cites a handful of studies (b) didn't really justify why these were the few studies you decided to choose (c) didn't actually present any findings / review / synthesis of the literature to paint a picture of a theoretical framework for PD that you can use to compare to the NEP. 4. A research question or clearly articulated aim would have helped to clearly establish what you are setting out to investigate. 5. Methods need to be made more clear. What type of QUAL design? There are so many to choose from. 6. Why a QUAL design? You haven't provided a rationale. 7. The context of the study has not been clearly defined, i.e., what is "higher ed" - what grades are you talking about. This should be explained early in the paper. 8. Participant demographics are absent. 9. The sampling method is not explained - random, purposive, etc. - and WHY it was the right sampling design choice and HOW exactly it was carried out. 10. No explanation of what types of questions were asked in the interviews, etc. 11. The data analysis process needs to be explained in detail - how was the thematic analysis done exactly? 12. No explanation is provided as to the measures that were taken by the researchers to ensure validity or trustworthiness, credibility, and transparency of data analysis and findings.

Overall, I would recommend that you find 2-3 papers that you consider as high quality on a topic similar to yours, using similar methods, and then model your paper's sections on that study. I think this would be a great way to ensure a sound foundation for your study's design. All the best, and I hope your study gets published whenever you feel it is ready.