



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_51545
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO STUDENT SUCCESS IN ONLINE AND MEDIASITE COURSES: A PRELIMINARY STUDY
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract is need to rewritten again. Make sure contents of Abstract were included problems statement, aim of the study, type of sampling method, total of respondents, method of data collection and analysis, findings of study and implications.</p> <p>No space before first sentence in Abstract. Justify Abstract.</p> <p>Add up at least three key words at the bottom of Abstract.</p> <p>Support sentences of “there are still students who fail to complete online classes, and while completion rates are better in MOOC’s, there remains concerns about the specific factors that contribute to success in online and media site courses. Some view these two as very similar modalities while others view them as disparate entities.” with some research as evidence of the problems existed.</p> <p>Move explanations in topic of “Literature review” and put it before “Materials and method” topic in perform a good sequential.</p> <p>In part of “Materials and method”, just elaborate study instruments such as “Media-site and Online Instruction” clearly. No need to mention your experiences regarding these instruments.</p> <p>In part of “Literature review”, try to write in critical thinking. Not just reported the results of theirs’ studies as pointed in number 1 to 10.</p> <p>Methodology part was not clear. Need to write in who were the respondents, total numbers of respondents, method of data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Research questions should be mentioned earlier after problem statements stated.</p> <p>The form of study result report needs to revise again. The writing of study report was very blur.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Whole texts should be justify and same paragraph spacing.</p> <p>Bold “Abstract”.</p> <p>Be mention full name of “MOOC” in make it clear to readers.</p> <p>In line 123 to 126, total of respondents should written in part of methodology. Not in “Results and discussion”.</p> <p>Move “Permission was procured from the office of Institutional research to conduct the study and all participants participated willingly.” to methodology part.</p> <p>Need to arrange “References” properly.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	This manuscript is not well organized. Need more efforts to arrange it in sequential order. This manuscript only can be published if all compulsory and minor comments have been done.	
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Liong Kon Thai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>The National University of Malaysia, Malaysia</i>