

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-54930**

Title: *Patterns and Predictors of Digital Microlearning Tool Use in Biology: A Quantitative Study of Higher Secondary Students*

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. Anam Zehra**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

A well-structured, timely, and methodologically sound manuscript investigating microlearning usage among higher secondary Biology students. The study aligns strongly with the priorities of NEP-2020 and digital pedagogy, and it offers empirical clarity on predictors such as perceived usefulness, digital self-efficacy, motivation, and resource availability. The use of validated tools, appropriate statistical techniques (t-tests, correlations, regression), and clear tables (e.g., descriptive statistics on page 6, predictor regression on page 11) adds substantial rigour to the paper. The manuscript is clear and well-written; however, minor improvements, such as reducing repetitive theoretical explanations, refining the conceptual framework, and ensuring consistent formatting across tables and visuals, would further enhance overall academic readability.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

- Clear and relevant research focus**, addressing microlearning adoption in Biology, a topic aligned with contemporary digital education initiatives.
- Strong conceptual framework**, integrating TAM, Self-Efficacy Theory, and Resource Availability Model (pp. 2–3), providing strong theoretical grounding.
- Well-defined methodology**, including stratified random sampling and a validated Digital Microlearning Usage Scale (CVI = 0.89; $\alpha = 0.87$), enhancing reliability.
- Effective use of statistical analyses** such as descriptive statistics, t-tests, correlations, and multiple regression (Table 5 on page 11 shows 48% variance explanation).
- Clear presentation of findings**, especially in tables and figures (e.g., bar charts on pp. 6–10), making results visually interpretable and easy to follow.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

6. **Practical educational implications** linked directly to NEP-2020, highlighting curricular integration, teacher training, and digital infrastructure needs.

WEAKNESSES

1. **Some concepts in the Introduction and Review** (e.g., definitions of microlearning, digital motivation) are repeated and could be condensed.
2. **Formatting inconsistencies**, especially in tables on pp. 6–11 (spacing, alignment, inconsistent bolding), require refinement.
3. **Interpretation sections are lengthy** and can be more focused to avoid redundancy after presenting statistical results.
4. **Figures and tables lack numbering consistency**; for instance, charts on pages 6, 10, and 12 do not follow uniform labelling.
5. **Discussion section**, though well-written, can include more comparative references to Indian school-level digital research to contextualise findings.