ABDURRAHMAN 1968 <abdurrahman.1968@fkip.unila.ac.id>

Review for Heliyon - manuscript revision decision
1 pesan

Heliyon <em@editorialmanager.com>   20 Januari 2021 03.42
Balas Ke: Heliyon <info@heliyon.com>
Kepada: Abdurrahman Abdurrahman <abdurrahman.1968@fkip.unila.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: HELIYON-D-21-00034
Impact of COVID -19 Pandemic on Learning Status of Student in Nepal
Gautam Prasad Chaudhary, Pharm D.; Jitendra Pandey, M. Pharm; Tonking Bastola, PHD; Randip Chaudhary, M. Pharm; Ram Bahadur Khadka, MSc. MLT; Anjana Lamichhane; Ravin Bhandari, M. Pharm; Nikita Das, MSc Nursing

Dear Dr Abdurrahman,

Thank you for reviewing the above referenced manuscript for Heliyon, an open access journal that is part of the Cell Press family. With your help, we have reached a revise decision on this manuscript.

The anonymised comments to author, from all reviewers, are included below. You can also access this information by logging into Editorial Manager as a reviewer.

Thank you for your contribution and time in reviewing this manuscript, which not only assisted us in reaching our decision, but also enables the author(s) to disseminate their work at the highest possible quality. Please note you may be asked to review the revision of this paper in the future.

I am grateful to you for your assistance as a reviewer for Heliyon.

Kind regards,

Tomayess Issa
Associate Editor - Social Sciences
Heliyon

Comments to author:
Editor's comments
Interesting work, but make sure to address the following comments: before the final submission:
1-   Literature review is missing, make sure to address and add this section in your work, also discuss the learning and teaching from your home country perspective.
2-   Assign a section for the research method and research question (s)
3-   Assign a section for the following headings:
a.   New significance and findings from the study
b.   Challenges and opportunities of learning and teaching during COVID-19
c.   Recommendations for online teaching in your home country
d.   Limitation and future research
4-   Grammar and proofreading are needed.
5-   Add up-to-date references to support your work.

Reviewer #1: Methods: The authors discuss the method in sufficient detail which is easy to understand.

Results: I like the way the authors divided the results into many subsections and discuss the findings in a very well manner.

Interpretation: Is it possible to generalize the results of the study to the entire student population, in Nepal? Please justify this point in conclusion part.

Other comments: It will be better if the authors compare their study with the same topic if any, I can see that no previous works were mentioned. I think there are many studies that discuss this topic or similar to it. At least discuss 5-8 studies.

Reviewer #2: Methods: Research design is poor for this journal's index. For example, using only descriptive statistics,

and more. This is very simple and requires no expertise.

Results: Results and discussion is not based on an adequate literature review.

Interpretation: Due to the nature of the findings, the comments could not be deepened.

Other comments:

Reviewer #3: Methods: clear, traditional, variables might be specified in a more detailed way

Results:clear, however more detailed specifics with regard to research population's replies might be interesting.

Interpretation: might be more specific if variables were specified in a more detailed way

Other comments: the mapping of the findings within a wider regional context (not just other countries, but various universities and fields of studies).
Further, conclusions from other research also mention the need for managerial improvement and relevant skills of the respective leaders. This point might be taken into account, as well.

Reviewer #4: 1.   Methods: Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied?

Yes. The method uses a self-designed semi-structured anonymous questionnaire, with 23 questions, applied to 589 10th (or more) degree students. The questionnaire was based on literature review, discussion groups and specialists query and aim to investigate the impact of COVID-19 pandemic in the learning status of the Nepalese students. The results were statistically analyzed by IBM SPSS Statistics.

2.   Results: Are the results or data that support any conclusions shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field?

Yes. But, in p11, l44 the authors suppose something that do not be asked in the questionnaire:
After the announcement, by the ministry of education of Nepal, to start and consider online education as a formal education system, most of the organization in Nepal announced the online class as a compulsory. Thus, this might be the possible reason for the involvement of the majority of the students in the online class, in our survey.

3.   Interpretation: Are the conclusions a reasonable extension of the results?

Yes. But, they discuss some government policies, and, perhaps, they could make recommendations to solve some of the pointed problems as support to exams, ways to deploy learning objects, appropriate the online classes touch to create an engaging educational environment, improve credit lines to devices acquisition or internet connection, etc.

4.   Ethics: Does the study's design, data presentation, and citations comply with standard COPE ethical guidelines and has proper approval and consent been acquired as outlined in our Editorial Policies: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/ethics?

Ethical Review Board (ERB) of the Pokhara University Nepal approved the ethical permission for the study. Privacy of all the personal information was kept throughout the study by securing the data and making participants information anonymous. All the participants helped this survey voluntarily. Consent section was added on questionnaire form and sent to all the participants to get response as agree or disagree to participate. The survey was conducted by adopting the guidelines given by the Declaration of Helsinki (revised in 2013) [14]. The study was conducted following the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES) guidelines [15].

Reviewer #5:
Theoretical foundations and literature review: the authors did not mention recent published papers regarding the same topic. Studies like Asanov, Flores, McKenzie, Mensmann & Schulte (2021); Moser, Wei, & Brenner (2021)

Methods: The main employed tool was the questionnaire. However, little information was given about the psychometric properties of the questionnaire.

Results: the main finding of the study is based upon the frequency of the collected data. To make a deeper understanding from the collected data, an inferential analysis is required.

Interpretation: the authors could relate their findings to the findings of other recent published studies.

Reviewer #6: Methods:

Results:

Interpretation:

Other The topic is very current.
Most of the impacts are related to poverty. The authors raised a vital issue and suggested an urgent way of solving it.
:

Reviewer #7: Methods: can be improved.

Results: can be improved.

Interpretation: can be improved.

Other comments:
Globally, the manuscript is well written and organized. The subject under study is interesting and deserves to be published. However, there are some issues and questions that must addressed and answered before the publication of the paper.
English needs a revision, through the whole document. Please refer to the attached commented document, where you can find some of the English issues highlighted in yellow.
A copy of the questionnaire used in the research should be provided, or a link to it.
In subsection "2.3. Study tool" the you state: "Questionnaire was prepared based on the literature review, scientific group discussion, obtaining recent information from news portals in discussion with specialists from different sectors." This study must, in fact, present a "literature review" (for example, a "state-of-the-art" or "related work" section is not presented in the manuscript) and present and discuss the "scientific group discussion" and "information from news portals in discussion with specialists from different sectors" that were used within this research context.
A discussion section, where authors should discuss the results and how they can be interpreted from the perspective of previous studies and of the working hypotheses, should also be added. The findings and their implications should be discussed in the broadest context possible. Future research directions may also be highlighted.
The conclusions should present the major or main conclusions achieved with the research and not focus on the policies that the government should take.

Reviewer #8: Methods:
- In the section study tool, "questionnaire was prepared based on the literature review" This needs to be supported with references.
- The author mentioned that "questionnaire was prepared based on the literature review" the references need to be written.
- The survey questionnaire was designed with closed-ended questions (yes, no, or maybe) as a result the authors decrease the participants' chance of providing accurate answers. The authors need to explain why they did not use the (5 or 7) point Likert Scale.
- The assessment of participants' responses to the questionnaire is not clear.
The majority of participants were in the Bachelor stage. why authors add post-graduate and SEE 10th-grade' students?

Results:
- The results did not discuss the teachers' role in the E-learning
- The results did not discuss the design of the e-content in the e-learning platforms.

Interpretation:
- Why authors did not interpret the role of teachers, content design, and the requirements of teaching the courses?

Other comments:
- Page. 4, Line 44: "2.5 lakh" lakh word needs to be modified.
- Proofreading is required for the current paper.
- Figure 1. is not clear (what is 1, 1, and 1. Also, why start the vertical Axis start from 0)

Reviewer #9: Methods:
the method used in the study was sound and help to achieve the objectives of the study

Results:

the results were presented in a clear way and able to depict the situation the paper was trying to assess.

Interpretation:

though interpretation was included in the results section, the authors were expected to comment deeper on what does these results could mean instead of just linking it with previous studies from the literature.
Other comments:
a copy of the used questionnaire should be attached to the paper

Reviewer #10: Methods: In this section two following questions should be answered:
How the samples were selected? What is the sampling method? The number of sample size were 384, why 589 students completed the questionnaire.
..
Results: Well organized.

Interpretation: In general, the article is a kind of descriptive study and lacks in-depth analysis and interpretation of the findings.

Other comments: What mean learning status? In introduction section some challenges related to students' learning should be mentioned. There is not any previous studies in the field of study in introduction section.

Reviewer #11: Methods:1.The subtitle "Student satisfaction with online classes" should not be a topic of discussion in the title "Impact of COVID -19 Pandemic on Learning Status of Student in Nepal". Because the sub-theme is an evaluation of the extent to which the implementation of the online learning program has been planned and implemented.
2.Because of its evaluative nature, the method used by the author of research methods should be used for program evaluation.

Results: The data presented supports the conclusions.

Interpretation: 1.The conclusion has extended the results of the research test. Namely by presenting the direct and indirect impacts of the research results.
2.However, the conclusion needs to be adjusted with the statement of research objectives as set out in the introduction. So the conclusion is the answer to the research question.

Other comments: 1. Study design, data presentation, and citations conform to standard COPE ethical guidelines and have obtained appropriate approvals and approvals.
2. Lack of ethical research on the theme of impact, because the Covid 19 pandemic is a condition that must be treated as a matter of destiny to be treated as a positive thinking attitude.

Reviewer #12: Methods: Discussion on methods used in the research is not comprehensive and therefore it raises doubt in the development and validity of the questionnaire. For instance, ref [13] cited is not related to the

questionnaire instrument used in the study. The author(s) did mention the development of the questionnaire derived from literature review, and professional group discussions, but no further elaboration on the structure and validity of the question items - although pilot study have been conducted, findings or outcome of the pilot study should also be reported. Out of 589 respondents, is all respondents' feedback valid for the analysis? Are there any missing value or unanswered question among those 589 respondents? The research design as well as the detail explanation on the instrument development and testing should be elaborated and justified in the methods section.

Results: The writing flow and organisation of the table/figure presented can be improved to increase readability of the paper. Some of the results presented such as in table 3 (line 23-28) and table 4 (line 55-59) did not give the total of 100%. This raise doubt on are there any missing value or unanswered questions from the respondents? Or any explanation to support the reason on these numbers? Table 5 "Do you think online mode of taking classes.. (line 23-27).." what does it mean by category "confused"? Does it mean "not sure" or "neither agree/disagree" instead?

Interpretation: Some of the interpretation of results are lack of critical judgment and supported by the literature. Might be this study is kind of exploratory study, but existing literature on the related field can be used to support the study design and discussion of findings. The other concern pertaining the interpretation of findings is because of the ambiguity of the construction of questionnaire and the questionnaire structure is not clearly presented.

Other comments: The research issue is interesting and the study purpose is very important to address the changing learning style due to pandemic COVID-19 in developing country. The researcher(s) have collected useful data with sufficient number of respondents. However, the detail design of the study is not elaborated comprehensively and another major concern is there is no literature review section in the paper. Discussion on the education level in Nepal would be appropriate for readers to grasp what is grade 10, 10+2 etc. in the demographic profile. Lack of discussion on the literature and background of the study makes it difficult to grasp the research gap this study try to addressed. Moreover, research objectives and/or research questions can be presented in the Introduction section so that the purpose of the paper and the survey can be better presented. I would also suggest English proof read to be done before the paper submission. Other minor suggestion are regarding
reference link (with many short forms) and list of abbreviations (ie. SEE) should be clearly presented in the beginning of the paper.

Reviewer #13: Methods: method is good

Results: Authors need to provide critical evaluation of their findings with the results already presented by many authors on the similar topics to highlight the novelty of their results.

Interpretation: Interpretations need more careful attention of authors.

Other comments:

Reviewer #14: Methods: Need detail expression especially in validity and reliability of the instrumentations

Results: Showed very interesting findings but sometimes lack of meaningful expression especially in the context of "learning status" indicators

Interpretation:Justifications and argumentations are clear enough

Other comments:

Reviewer #15: Methods:
Simple percentage distribution was employed only

Results:

Interpretation:

Other comments:
The authors of this article used a questionnaire distributed via social media and then used a simple percentage distribution to evaluate the learning status of students during the lock-down due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The whole research shows the % of students who faced different issues due to online teaching (which is more or less the same problems in most countries around the world), but it does not provide any solution or suggest to any of those issues discussed, on how to overcome them or even how to improve the status of the Nepalese students. Furthermore, how this research will help readers from other countries

More information and support
You will find guidance and support on reviewing, as well as information including details of how Elsevier recognizes reviewers, on Elsevier's Reviewer Hub: https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers
FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?
https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/
For further assistance, please visit our customer service site: https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/
Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

_____

Invitation to review for Heliyon
1 pesan

Heliyon <em@editorialmanager.com>   6 Januari 2021 08.24
Balas Ke: Heliyon <info@heliyon.com>
Kepada: Abdurrahman Abdurrahman <abdurrahman.1968@fkip.unila.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: HELIYON-D-21-00034
Impact of COVID -19 Pandemic on Learning Status of Student in Nepal
Gautam Prasad Chaudhary, Pharm D.; Jitendra Pandey, M. Pharm; Tonking Bastola, PHD; Randip Chaudhary, M. Pharm; Ram Bahadur Khadka, MSc. MLT; Anjana Lamichhane; Ravin Bhandari, M. Pharm; Nikita Das, MSc Nursing

Dear Dr Abdurrahman,

Because of your substantial expertise related to the manuscript listed above, I kindly invite you to review the above-mentioned manuscript for publication in Heliyon. External reviews are the single most important element in critically evaluating a manuscript and we appreciate the time and attention that is required. Your acceptance of this invitation constitutes a major contribution to insuring the continuing quality and success of the journal. We would greatly appreciate receiving your response to this invitation within 7 days.

Heliyon, an open access journal that is part of the Cell Press family, that publishes scientifically accurate and valuable research across the entire spectrum of science and medicine. Once published, all articles will be immediately and permanently available for readers to read, download, and share.

We have developed a comprehensive set of review guidelines to ensure that all our published content adheres to best practices in journal publishing, accepted standards in publication ethics and our aim to publish accurate research regardless of the perceived impact. Our review criteria are displayed below for your convenience.

To accept the invitation and view the manuscript, please click this link: https://www.editorialmanager. com/heliyon/l.asp?i=1430657&l=XEGJ7TTW   Please note that by agreeing to review this manuscript, you are declaring that you have no conflict of interest.

If you cannot review this manuscript, please click the link below. We would very much appreciate if you could suggest an appropriate alternate reviewer. Please do keep diversity of gender, career stage and geography in mind as you make these suggestions. https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/l.asp?i=1430658&l=BFX8728I

If, for any reason, the above links do not work, please log in as a reviewer at https://www.editorialmanager. com/heliyon/.

If you accept this invitation, I would be very grateful if you would return your review within 14 days of accepting this invitation. We understand that the global COVID-19 situation may well be causing disruption for you and your colleagues. If that is the case for you and you would need more time than usual to be able to complete this review, please let us know so we can agree on a time frame that works for you.

Review criteria:
1.   Methods: Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied?
2.   Results: Are the results or data that support any conclusions shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field?
3.   Interpretation: Are the conclusions a reasonable extension of the results?
4.   Ethics: Does the study's design, data presentation, and citations comply with standard COPE ethical guidelines and has proper approval and consent been acquired as outlined in our Editorial Policies: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/ ethics?

We have also attached some additional resources regarding peer review at the end of this invitation.

Please note that you should treat this invitation, the manuscript and your review as confidential. You must not share your review or information about the review process with anyone without the agreement of the editors and authors involved, even after publication. This also applies to other reviewers' "comments to author" which are shared with you after a decision (and vice versa).

We look forward to receiving your response to this review request and thank you in advance for your contribution and time.

As a reviewer you are entitled to complimentary access to references, abstracts, and full-text articles on ScienceDirect and Scopus for 30 days. Full details on how to claim your access via Reviewer Hub (reviewerhub.elsevier.com) will be provided upon your acceptance of this invitation to review.

Please visit the Elsevier Reviewer Hub (reviewerhub.elsevier.com) to manage all your refereeing activities for this and other Elsevier journals on Editorial Manager.

Kind regards,

Tomayess Issa
Associate Editor - Social Sciences
Heliyon

*****

Please also note that authors have been invited to convert their supplementary material into a Data in Brief article (a data description article). You may notice this change alongside the revised manuscript. You do not need to review this but may need to look at the files in order to confirm that any supporting information you requested is present there.

Abstract:
This study was designed to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, on the learning status of students from different educational boards and universities of Nepal. An online survey was conducted from 10th-20th September 2020, to record the data. A self-designed questionnaire link, using "Goggle form" was sent to the students via social networks i.e. Messenger, WhatsApp, Email, and Viber. A total of 589 participants shared the complete information, related to the survey. The simple percentage distribution was employed to evaluate the learning status of the students. During the lockdown period, more than 70% of students were engaged in online classes, most commonly by using the Zoom app. The majority of the students were using WIFI as an internet source, to attend online classes. Students have been suffering from various problems related to anxiety, stress, economic crises, poor internet connectivity, deprivation of study materials, required e-learning accessories, and unsuitable study environment. Mainly, students from remote areas and middle families suffered from enormous challenges for study during this COVID-19 pandemic. Among those participants, who were being able to attend the online classes, the majority of students (70%) were dissatisfied with running online classes. Only 23.3% of participants suggested the feasibility of online classes in near future, as it is very difficult for Nepal to cope with the challenges, due to the lack of scientific government strategies. Our study recommended that training about online classes to the teacher and students might create effectiveness towards e-learning. Government needs to provide free internet services to the remote areas and the poor students, since in the current scenario, huge numbers of the population are struggling with the economic burden.

Keywords: COVID-19; Lockdown; E-learning; pandemic

Resources for new reviewers to prepare you for writing a Peer Review report:
* If you are new to peer-review and are interested in learning more about the peer review process, we encourage you to partake in Elsevier's Researcher Academy's Certified Peer Reviewer Course, which will allow you to develop an in-depth knowledge of the peer review process, and assist you in writing a helpful peer review report:
https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/navigating-peer-review/certified-peer-reviewer-course
* You can also view Cell Press's initiatives designed to improve the peer review process and to help early career researchers become effective reviewers at Cell Press Steps Forward in Peer Review here: https://www.cell.com/peer-review
* Finally, please see here for Heliyon's guide for reviewers: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/guide-for-referees

More information and support
FAQ: How do I respond to an invitation to review in Editorial Manager?
https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28524/supporthub/publishing/
You will find guidance and support on reviewing, as well as information including details of how Elsevier recognizes reviewers, on Elsevier's Reviewer Hub: https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers
FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?
https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/
For further assistance, please visit our customer service site: https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/
Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

_____

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at

any time. (Use the following URL: https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/login.asp?a=r). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.