# **Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_110366
Title of the Manuscript:	A comprehensive Review on Role of Distance Learning Program towards the Development of Global Education System
Type of the Article	Review Article

### **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		,
<ol> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?         (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable?         (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> </ol>	1. The manuscript important for the scientific community. As written in this article, this review provides insights into how distance learning programs are shaping the future of education on a global scale. Additionally, it discusses the implications for policymakers, educators, and students, highlighting the potential of distance learning to bridge educational gaps, promote inclusivity, and empower individuals to pursue education regardless of their geographical location or socioeconomic circumstances.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	2. Title. Could we improve upon "A comprehensive Review on Role of Distance Learning Program	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	towards the Development of Global Education System". This title contains 16 words. Maybe too	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	long. As in several examples of articles in this journal, the number of words in the title is no more than 14 words. The key word " A comprehensive Review on " is not useful. Please consider these suggestions: Role of Distance Learning Program towards the Development of Global Education	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	System.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	3. The abstract is concise and informative. The author has briefly explained the aim of the work, techniques and methods used, main findings with important data and conclusions.	
	<b>4.</b> Overall, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are in accordance with the Author Guidelines in this journal. However, it would be nice if some subsections were displayed clearly. It is necessary to indicate where the methods, results and discussion.	
	5. The manuscript is scientifically correct	
	<ol><li>The references used meet the criteria of a scientific journal and are mostly taken from recent articles.</li></ol>	
	Recommendation: Accept subject to minor revisions	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

## **Review Form 1.7**

### PART 2:

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Henderikus Dasrimin
Department, University & Country	State University of Malang, Indonesia

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)