

Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number COGENTEDU-2023-1140**The four-stage model of competence development and the teaching profession**

Original Submission
Herman Herman, Dr **Reviewer 2**

[Back](#) [Edit Review](#) [Print](#) [Submit Review to Editorial Office](#)

Recommendation: **Unsound or fundamentally flawed**

Custom Review Question(s):

As a thank you and to acknowledge the contribution of our reviewers, the journal may publish a list of the names of those who have reviewed at the end of the year. This will not be linked to any specific paper and will only be done if the list of reviewers is long enough to protect the anonymity of the review process for individual papers. If you would prefer for your name **not to be included** in a published list of reviewers, please indicate this below.

If anyone else was involved in writing this report, for example a student or a colleague, and they agree to be recognised for this work please provide their name and email address in the free text box below.

Do you want to get recognition for this review on [Publons](#)?

Don't let your reviewing work go unnoticed! Researchers the world over use Publons to effortlessly track their valuable peer review contributions for any journal. If you opt in, your Publons profile will automatically be updated to show a verified record of this review in full compliance with the journal's review policy. If you don't have a Publons profile, you will be prompted to create a free account. [[Learn more](#)]

I confirm that I have the necessary subject knowledge and expertise to review this article, and have no conflict of interest that would prevent me from offering an unbiased review.

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation

Conclusions – overall evaluation

References – overall evaluation

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation

Writing – overall evaluation

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation

Comments to the author

Response

Include my name

Yes

Yes

Yes

Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Not applicable

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Sound

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Not applicable

Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Not applicable

Outstanding

Sound

As overall, this paper is interesting, but there are some points to be paid more attention:

1. This paper doesn't meet the standard elements of being an article (Title, Abstract, Introduction, Research Method, Results, Discussion, Conclusion and References)
2. Abstract needs to follow the structure such as objectives, phenomena, method, results and discussion
3. Some of the references used were old, and the good one is at least 3 years (minimum 2020)
4. This article needs to be proofread by native

Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor:

As overall, this paper is interesting, but there are some points to be paid more attention:

1. This paper doesn't meet the standard elements of being an article (Title, Abstract, Introduction, Research Method, Results, Discussion, Conclusion and References)
2. Abstract needs to follow the structure such as objectives, phenomena, method, results and discussion
3. Some of the references used were old, and the good one is at least 3 years (minimum 2020)
4. This article needs to be proofread by native

These all 4 items that I comment to authors.

This paper's position is major revision. Authors can revise the paper again or You can declined article

[Back](#) [Edit Review](#) [Print](#) [Submit Review to Editorial Office](#)