



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AIR_19816 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Advances in Modern Physics: Transition from Positivism to Post-positivism in Education and Research |
| Type of the Article | Opinion 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>(i) An opinion article in particular must be written in good academic English. This article needs to be completely rewritten preferably with help from a good mother-language speaker informed on the topics. This must include clear use of technical and correct use of non-technical vocabulary. Technical language is here generally used correctly but due to poor English its effectiveness is often lost. This is a pity as the ideas are potentially interesting. Too many sentences have a language problem. Eg The first sentence contains a problem with the definite article and also a vague yet emphatic turn of phrase.</p> <p>(ii) Brevity and conciseness of expression needs to be improved in order to effectively communicate and not cause the reader unnecessary discomfort and confusion. This is both language and content. It's difficult to separate the two when we are discussing sentence and paragraph structure, since the argumentation is important here. Ambiguity of language must be avoided.</p> <p>(iii) The title needs to be clearer and more inviting to the reader. Example: Concerning the Need for a Transition from Positivism to Post-positivism in Science and Education or similar. Even this needs refinement.</p> <p>(iv) In the abstract the word 'classical' is used relating to education. This is an allusion between classical education and classical physics. An allusion or an analogy can be reflected on and explored in an academic article</p> | <p>Thanks to the respected referee for his valuable and comprehensive comments. Thanks also for finding the idea interesting. The author feedback is paragraph by paragraph as follows:</p> <p>(i) The manuscript has been read carefully and corrected throughout. The corrections have been made with the assistance of Professors in the English department. However it may still reflect that the author is not a natural English speaker and in a way it should do so, in my opinion, as long as there is no grammatical errors and expressions that may cause misunderstanding. Because I think that English is a language of the globe not a language of only native speakers like any other local languages. Please accept my apologies if there are still some ineffectiveness.</p> <p>(ii) Brevity and conciseness of expression is tried to be improved in order to effectively communicate and not cause the reader unnecessary discomfort and confusion throughout the paper as mentioned above.</p> <p>(iii) The title has been changed to "On the Requirement for a Transition from Positivism</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | but can not be used carelessly or rhetorically as it appears to be here. It should also not be presented accidentally. | to Post-positivism in Science and Education” (iv) The word “classical” has been changed to “traditional” |
|--|--|---|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>This is a conceptual/intellectual imprecision reflecting a general lack of analytical philosophical methods in the paper that must be improved upon to express and refine the author's interesting insights. Rhetorical and persuasive language is best avoided in an academic work.</p> <p>(v) Emphatic and rich descriptive language is to be used only with proportional justification and clarification. e.g 'dramatically characterized' and 'provided great insights to mankind' in the first paragraph were used in the text with no examples to support their use. Further not all mankind has understood the insights which might be considered great – it is what is called a sweeping statement. Best avoided or refined.</p> <p>(vi) A number of other such critical issues exist to be researched by the author at leisure along similar lines.</p> <p>(vii) The document is discursive and essay like without precision. It insufficiently explains the key concepts in the introduction, and neither does it sufficiently reference them in order, tending to mix ideas, history, observations and argumentation together in a poorly structured way. For example in the first sentence of the introduction the two stages of learning are not supported by either justification or references. Either would perhaps have done. The reference to Trochim was seemingly not correct and repeated attempts failed to find the linked document. A more permanent and reliable approach to key references is required.</p> <p>Serious but in principle correctable problems with language, structure and consequent argumentation. I would consider this document a draft or set of notes for a yet to be completed academic paper. Interesting ideas and opinions are however present in the paper.</p> | <p>Thanks for finding some interesting insights. In general, rhetorical and persuasive language is tried to be avoided in order to have a certain intellectual and academic precision by a critical reading of the paper and the changes are highlighted.</p> <p>(v) In order to be more descriptive some examples have been added in the text between the lines 29-32. Also the word “mankind” changed to “scientists” in the first paragraph.</p> <p>(vi) Same done for the other critical issues in the lines 38-44, 59-62, 84-90, 102-106, 130-133, 172-177 and highlighted in the text.</p> <p>(vii) Two references were added in the first sentence. Other references were also added throughout the paper. The Trochim reference has been corrected.</p> <p>Thanks again for finding interesting ideas and opinions. All the other problems have been tried to be corrected as suggested in various sections and highlighted.</p> |
|--|--|--|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| <u>Minor REVISION comments</u> | <p>(i) if possible the tone of the article should be more impersonal, again this requires a higher level of English writing skills.</p> <p>(ii) Choice of non-technical phrases needs to be more precise eg “to get close to the truth” is a poor choice of phrase in the context of scientific methods.</p> <p>(iii) the use of italics appears to follow from rhetorical considerations rather than technical ones. Consistency and justification of such choices is necessary. This again shows philosophical imprecision from the author and a lack of attention to the analytical details of methodology.</p> | |
| <u>Optional/General comments</u> | <p>The ideas and observations covered are interesting and worthy of an opinion article in this journal. The author has a story to tell. It needs, however, to be rewritten to a far higher standard and resubmitted, with possible subsequent further rewritings. It would do the author no justice to accept the document in its current form. I hope the author has the tenacity and opportunity to continue in this improvement, as advised. This document is a draft, or even simply a set of good personal notes, but it is far from a finished paper. Much of the paper needs reorganisation and further explication. Ideally with feedback from other researchers who can aid in reflection and criticism. The author, who is clearly insightful and sufficiently aware of the material to pass comment in an opinion article needs group input, or the input of a tutor in order to refine their methods and explication. This may seem hard work, but is necessary academically.</p> | |