REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55295**

Title: Enhancing Licensure Examination Readiness in General and Professional Education: Evidence from a Pretest-Posttest Study of Structured Review Lectures

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. TOUSEEF MALIK**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

This manuscript addresses an important institutional and licensure-related concern, providing a workable pretest–posttest evaluation of a LET review intervention with domain-level reporting that can inform program improvements. However, the paper requires tighter reporting transparency, particularly regarding sample-size discrepancies, handling of missing data and exclusions, and consistent scoring metrics across tables. The promised reliability indices and effect size results should be explicitly presented to support conclusions about practical significance.

Recommendation: Accept after major revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths

1. The study targets a well-defined, practically relevant outcome (LET readiness) and aligns the intervention with clearly defined content domains (General Education and Professional Education).

2. The quasi-experimental pretest–posttest approach is appropriate for an institutional review context, and the design rationale is explicitly stated (participants serving as their own control).

3. The use of parallel-form pre-/post-instruments is a meaningful methodological choice that helps reduce testing/practice effects and strengthens the interpretability of score changes.

4. The statistical approach is standard and understandable (descriptives and paired t-tests), and the manuscript indicates attention to practical significance via effect sizes.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. Reporting includes both overall and domain-level outcomes, supporting actionable insights (e.g., identifying where gains occur and where gaps remain).

Weaknesses

1. No control/comparison group is included, which limits causal attribution to the review lectures and leaves key threats to internal validity unaddressed (history, maturation, concurrent studying, regression-to-the-mean).

2. Participant counts are inconsistent (the narrative reports a higher N than what appears in the inferential tables), without a clear explanation of exclusions or missing data handling.

3. Program subgroup sizes are highly imbalanced (including very small subgroups), yet program-level comparisons are still interpreted; these subgroup statistics are likely unstable.

4. The manuscript states that reliability and effect sizes were computed, but the actual reliability coefficients and effect size values are not clearly reported, limiting judgment of measurement quality and practical impact.

5. There appear to be internal reporting/metric coherence issues across tables (e.g., pretest means differing notably between tables), which require clarification of scoring scales, sample bases, or potential reporting errors.