



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_11887
Title of the Manuscript:	Incorporating e-mail in teaching activities of the nutrition program at College for Women, Kuwait University: Assessment of a 5-year experience
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Methods 1 The use of emails in this study is not sufficiently described. It appears that in order to read emails sent by the course instructor, the students had to log in to a joint email account used by all the other students of the same course. To send replies or requests to the course instructor, students had to use their personal email account. This concept does not appear user-friendly compared to modern web-based tools for teaching and learning. The reasons for setting up such a service should be explained in detail. 2 In a survey (Table 3) the students were asked to rate their agreement on various statements. There were three possible ratings: "agree", "no opinion", "disagree". The low number of possible ratings limits the interpretation of the data. Why was this low number of ratings chosen?	Methods 1. Yes, this was the fashion in which the communication by e-mail intended – which is unique. It was explained in the manuscript that when students send messages to the instructor they use their own e-mail accounts and send them to the instructor's e-mail account. This was designed in this way so that: - A- The course e-mail would not be cluttered with unnecessary messages, which may cause confusion. - B- Students write messages that express their purposes and to receive personalized responses from the course instructor. Such would be a desirable to enhance one-on-one communication, for would be benefit to the student. - C- It would be possible to account for messages received from students and categorize them according to purpose. 2. This is currently explained in the revised manuscript. However, this point can be addressed as follows: - A- With the low number of students in each class, this 3-number of was chosen after 30 questionnaires were collected over a duration of one academic year. This was used as a pilot to test if it would serve as an index to student acceptance level of this means of communication. - B- As this was found to be satisfactory (discriminating enough) as an index, student responses were added with the years to come until the end of Spring Semester of 2014 currently N=379).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3 It is unclear how many researchers / authors participated in the analysis of the data. This should be reported. 4 Line 107-108: "E-mail was used in courses that were taught by the same instructor, the author, in the undergraduate nutrition curriculum." The data in this study apparently represent the email communication of one instructor only. This is a limitation of the study that needs to be addressed clearly in the methods and discussion section. Results 5 In the abstract (line 25-27) it says: "Using e-mail in university teaching activities and in maintaining a satisfactory level of student-teacher communication can have benefits to education in the long run." The results presented in the paper indicate that the emails were mainly used for administrative and social issues. There are no data to support any effects this email system may have had on teaching or learning outcomes. Was there any attempt to collect such data?	3. The copy of the manuscript that you were provided was blind. This will eventually be revealed when it is determined that the paper is accepted for publication. However, there is a single author for this paper. 4. This also can be a point of strength – the fashion in which this e-mail communication was “uniform”. This point is currently addressed in the revised manuscript. Results 5. The literature on this topic supports the expressed point. The data presented show that there was a dynamic engagement between students and their instructor. Measuring the outcome of this means of communication was not among the objectives of this work. However, your suggestion constitutes an excellent idea for a well-designed study in the.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Introduction 1. In order to assess the impact of the email use, the authors might provide information on how students and instructors communicated before the introduction of the email service.	Introduction 1. The means of student-teacher communication before incorporating the e-mail into the picture was that traditional fashion, in which such was done in the classroom, during specified office hours any by telephone. Measuring the impact of using this medium on learning is a good suggestion for a future piece of work.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper reports on the use of e-mail in the communication between instructors and students participating in several university courses. A new email account was set up for each course. All students participating in a specific course had access to this joint email account using a shared username and password. The course instructor used this account to send emails to students participating in this course. Students were not allowed to send emails to the course instructor using this specific account. If they wished to communicate with their instructor they had to use their personal email account. The paper reports data on the content of the emails as well as results from a user survey.	Yes, this is a very accurate description of the content of this manuscript.