

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-54273**

Title: Cross-Curricular Approaches and the Development of Core Skills among First-Year University Students in Mozambique

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality	✓			
Clarity	✓			
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr Lastri Wahyuni Manurung

Date: 11th of October 2025

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Findings

The findings section (lines 200–399) is logically structured and makes good use of both qualitative and quantitative data. Although the data is presented clearly, figures and tables need more in-depth explanations. The statistical findings are succinctly reported, but further analysis is required to determine the implications of the correlations for curriculum design. The study mostly relies on self-reported data, which is a methodological drawback that warrants careful consideration.

Discussion and Analysis

Though it frequently recaps rather than analyzes, the discussion (lines 237–399) correctly links findings with earlier research (e.g., Morin, Beane, Almeida). The author ought to delve more into the critical interpretation, explaining why these findings are significant, how they support or contradict earlier research, and what ramifications there are for Mozambican pedagogy or educational policy. Additionally, there may be a more seamless transition from findings to conversation. Although they are clearly articulated, the "priority areas for intervention" (lines 356–399) might use a clearer connection to the data and theoretical framework.

REVIEWER'S REPORT**Overall Evaluation**

The paper exhibits academic promise and is well-written. However, it requires the following in order to meet IJAR standards:

- A more distinct research gap and uniqueness in the introduction.

- More current and global literature to bolster the theoretical underpinnings.
- A more thorough analysis and critical debate of the results.
- More accurate academic writing with sporadic grammatical adjustments.

Therefore, a major revision is necessary.

Line	Comment / Suggestion
5–10	The abstract is clear, but it could include a brief mention of the methodology (e.g., “using a mixed-methods approach combining survey and interviews”).
11–19	Consider emphasizing what makes this study original within Mozambican or African higher education research.
23–31	Well contextualized, but avoid long sentences; split for clarity.
32–37	Include a reference to recent government or institutional education policies (post-2020).
43–47	Clearly define the research problem—how exactly do current curricula fail to support skill development?
48–56	Objectives are well stated but could be rewritten using parallel structure (each starting with a verb).
57–64	The rationale is good but repetitive. Reduce overlap between academic and societal significance.
65–74	The literature review introduction should outline key themes before delving into subsections.
82–87	Add newer references (e.g., OECD, UNESCO 2020) to support Bologna-process impacts.
88–93	Define “cross-curricular” explicitly for the local context, perhaps with an example from Mozambican universities.
94–102	The paragraph is dense; divide into two. Add a citation when discussing “curriculum designers recognize.”
118	Typo: “CoreCompetencies” should have a space (“Core Competencies”).
129–131	Provide a source for the four broader domains beyond Donaciano & Almeida (2011).
144–167	Excellent theoretical synthesis. Consider summarizing key points in a table for clarity.
168–196	Methodology is strong, but clarify how the mixed-methods design was integrated (sequential, concurrent, or explanatory?).
186–188	Justify why only 10% of participants were selected for interviews—was this sufficient for data saturation?
192–195	Specify the criteria used in thematic analysis (e.g., coding steps, reliability check).
200–207	Add the sample’s institutional names or a general description to improve transparency.
213–	Figure 1 needs to be labeled clearly (axes, source caption). Include brief analysis within the text,

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Line	Comment / Suggestion
219	not only numbers.
221– 227	Good quotes, but identify whether interviews were in English or Portuguese (for transparency).
231– 236	Consider adding a statistical reference or citation for “low levels of student satisfaction.”
245– 250	Table 2 formatting: align headings properly and describe what the scale measures (Likert range).
251– 255	Explain why the results show low cross-curricular engagement—could institutional or cultural factors play a role?
278– 292	Excellent use of statistics. However, report correlation coefficients with p-values consistently.
306– 311	Discuss how self-reporting bias might influence correlation strength.
312– 355	Strong comparative analysis, but include examples of what “flexible and market-oriented logic” means in practice.
356– 399	Very good section; strengthen by adding a brief conclusion to tie all four intervention areas together.
400– 455	The final considerations summarize well but should emphasize theoretical contribution and policy implications more clearly.
448– 450	Limitation: Suggest including regional diversity and longitudinal follow-up as future directions.
502– 505	The note about AI-assisted translation should be removed from the manuscript before publication—it’s unnecessary for readers.