

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54329

Date: 15/10/25

Title: The Past and Present of Digital Technology and Its Impact on Higher Education

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*).....

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

Reviewer Name: Dr Gulnawaz

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. Abstract and Introduction (Lines 1–45)

The abstract clearly summarizes the central theme — the transformation of higher education through digital technology. However, it would benefit from more **quantitative context** (e.g., statistics or evidence-based claims) to support the general statements (Lines 5–15). The problem statement (Lines 16–30) is coherent but somewhat descriptive; introducing the **specific research gap** or **objective** would strengthen focus.

In the introduction (Lines 31–45), the author provides historical context for digital technology's evolution, but transitions between “technological development” and “educational impact” could be smoother. Consider refining sentences for flow and academic tone — for instance, replacing “we are living in a digital age” (Line 38) with “Contemporary higher education operates within a digital ecosystem.”

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. Literature Review (Lines 46–115)

The literature review effectively traces digital education's evolution, referencing online learning platforms, MOOCs, and virtual classrooms. Yet, citations (e.g., Lines 52–65) should be expanded to include **recent post-COVID studies** (2022–2025) that reflect the **current pedagogical transformations**.

Lines 70–85 discuss advantages such as flexibility and accessibility, but the section could include counterarguments — such as digital divide, data privacy, or screen fatigue — to ensure **balanced critical evaluation**.

In Lines 90–115, the author references several theoretical perspectives but lacks **clear synthesis** — connecting how each source contributes to the argument. Adding linking phrases such as “Similarly,” “In contrast,” or “Building upon...” would improve scholarly cohesion.

3. Methodology (Lines 116–165)

The methodology section describes the research design as qualitative and descriptive (Lines 120–135), which is appropriate for a conceptual paper. However, it lacks **clear details about sampling, data sources, or analytical procedures**. If based on secondary data, specify how the literature was selected (criteria, databases, timeframe).

Lines 140–160 could also indicate how themes were derived — e.g., content analysis, thematic synthesis, or comparative analysis. Without methodological clarity, the findings risk appearing subjective. Including even a brief **methodological framework** (for instance, a diagram or stepwise process) would enhance transparency.

4. Analysis and Discussion (Lines 166–260)

This is the strongest section conceptually. The discussion connects digital transformation with learning outcomes, student engagement, and institutional adaptation. The use of comparative examples (e.g., online vs. traditional classrooms in Lines 180–195) is insightful.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

However, from Lines 200–230, the tone becomes more descriptive than analytical. To improve scholarly depth, consider integrating **empirical evidence** — statistics from UNESCO, OECD, or national higher education reports. For instance, citing enrollment growth in online programs post-pandemic would substantiate claims about “massive expansion” (Line 210).

Lines 235–260 discuss challenges such as infrastructure and digital literacy — a critical inclusion. Yet, the section could benefit from highlighting **policy implications** or **institutional recommendations** (e.g., teacher training, blended curriculum models, government funding).

5. Conclusion and Recommendations (Lines 261–290)

The conclusion successfully summarizes major findings but should avoid repetition of earlier sections (Lines 262–270). Instead, emphasize **actionable recommendations** — for example:

- Integrating AI-based tools for personalized learning
- Implementing continuous professional development for faculty
- Enhancing equity through affordable digital access

Lines 275–290 could end more strongly by restating the **study's contribution** — how it advances current discourse on digital transformation in education.

6. References (Lines 291–End)

The references are relevant but unevenly formatted — ensure uniformity (APA 7th edition recommended). Several in-text citations (e.g., Lines 70, 150, 240) are missing corresponding entries in the reference list. Include recent sources (2022–2025) for stronger contemporary relevance.