

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<b>Instructional Technology Partner in Learning</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BPR_3766</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Instructional Technology Partner in Learning</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Complete Book</b>

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This Book'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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/book-benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript highlights a significant contribution to the scientific community by addressing critical issues in integrating instructional technology into teaching and learning processes. Its comprehensive exploration of 21st-century digital tools, multimedia principles, and e-learning strategies offers valuable insights for educators and policymakers alike. The contextual analysis of Ghana's educational landscape adds depth to the global conversation on technology adoption in classrooms, making it a vital resource for advancing research and practical applications in educational technology.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	No, it is not a suitable title. It should be corrected to " <b>Instructional Technology: Partner in Learning</b> "	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	From the manuscript, the abstract appears to be presented as part of the <i>Introduction</i> section, summarizing the purpose, objectives, and key themes of the book. It emphasizes the book's aim to help educators integrate technology into their teaching, overcome challenges, and promote learner-centered approaches. However, it could benefit from additional clarity and structure to ensure comprehensiveness and alignment with academic standards for abstracts. Suggested Improvements: 1. Summarize Key Points Clearly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The abstract should explicitly outline the key aspects covered, such as the evolution of instructional technology, practical tools and strategies, and the emphasis on context-specific challenges like those in Ghana.</li> <li>○ Include highlights of the book's unique features, such as the reflections, problem-solving focus, and contextual adaptability.</li> </ul> 2. Add Specific Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mention the target audience more explicitly (e.g., educators, policymakers, student-teachers).</li> <li>○ Highlight the practical applications of the book's content, like the implementation of e-learning or multimedia principles.</li> </ul> 3. Highlight Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasize what makes the book stand out compared to similar works (e.g., its focus</li> </ul>	

**Review Form2**

	<p>on national standards, simplicity, or context-specific solutions).</p> <p>4. Avoid Repetition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some ideas appear redundant in the current introduction. Streamlining them can enhance readability.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<p>The manuscript's structure appears to be well-organized, with a clear division into chapters and subsections that follow a logical progression. Each chapter addresses a distinct aspect of instructional technology, beginning with foundational concepts and moving toward practical tools, models, and applications. However, some aspects of the subsections and structure could benefit from refinement to enhance clarity, flow, and ease of navigation.</p> <p>Some suggestions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate overlaps.</li> <li>• Uniformity in reflections</li> <li>• Use bulleted / numbered lists</li> <li>• Each and every chapter requires Summary and Conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by grounding its discussions in established theories, models, and frameworks in instructional technology. It references key principles such as the ASSURE and NTEQ models, the ADDIE process, and National Educational Technology Standards, ensuring alignment with widely accepted educational standards. The use of empirical insights, especially in the context of Ghana's educational challenges and opportunities, adds depth and relevance. Furthermore, the authors emphasize evidence-based practices, such as leveraging multimedia principles and problem-solving software, which are supported by cognitive science research and practical applications in the field.</p>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally clear and accessible, making it suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sections could benefit from greater precision, reduced redundancy, and improved sentence structure to ensure academic rigor and enhance readability.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>It is well-structured, scientifically robust, and provides valuable insights, but improvements in language precision, structural consistency, and conciseness could enhance its overall quality.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	V.V. Subrahmanyam
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	School of Computer and Information Sciences, IGNOU, India