View Reviews

Paper ID   206

Paper Title   An approach to mobile app design and development combining design
                      thinking, user experience, and iterative-incremental development

Reviewer #3

Questions

1. Detailed Comments

Introduction and background

The introduction needs to be developed further to clearly establish the justification/ importance of the new initiative and articulate the research problem and objective; these need to be specifically linked to the associated issues and problems. The introduction would benefit from a succinct description of what the paper is about and a stronger emphasis on the problem addressed by the research.

Furthermore, the paper needs to explain how this literature was selected to be reviewed, i.e., what selection method was followed and how it was ensured that the review was sufficiently comprehensive and reflected the current state of the art. It would be helpful in clarifying the importance of the proposed study if the paper can include some of the latest article references published in recent years associated with the scope of the current research.

The authors can consider the following papers regarding the use of App Inventor to teach novice programmers:

Papadakis, S., Kalogiannakis, M., Orfanakis, V., & Zaranis, N. (2019). The appropriateness of scratch and app inventor as educational environments for teaching introductory programming in primary and secondary education. In Early childhood development: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications (pp. 797-819). IGI Global.

Papadakis, S., & Orfanakis, V. (2016, November). The combined use of Lego Mindstorms NXT and App Inventor for teaching novice programmers. In International Conference EduRobotics 2016 (pp. 193-204). Springer, Cham.

2. Please rate your satisfaction with the basic sections (introduction, conclusion, works cited, etc.) ?

Good

3. The material is ordered in a way that is logical, clear, and easy to follow?

Good

4. The writer adequately summarizes and discusses the topic?

Good

5. The writer makes some contribution of thought to the paper or merely summarizes data or publications?

Good

6. The writer introduces and documents sources adequately and appropriately?

Good

7. The formatting of the manuscript is in accordance to the prescribed paper format?

Good

8. The paragraphs and sentences are cohesive (flow together smoothly without disruption in the train of thought)?

Good

9. Are there any grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors?

The paper would benefit from a professional proofreading.

Reviewer #4

Questions

1. Detailed Comments

• The abstract may be extended further to about 200 words. It should be a microcosm of the full article. Author may try to include the principal aim of the paper, the challenge to be solved, the conclusion, performance standards and competing approaches.

• The authors should clearly highlight the gap studies and justify the reasons in the Introduction section.

• It would be much better if the proposed methods could be compared to other similar methods, using a common comparison framework.

• Results section has to be improved as no comparison and improvement is claimed.

• This paper requires moderate revision and amendments to be accepted for publication. The author(s) may simply need to make a few changes.

2. Please rate your satisfaction with the basic sections (introduction, conclusion, works cited, etc.) ?

Good

3. The material is ordered in a way that is logical, clear, and easy to follow?

Good

4. The writer adequately summarizes and discusses the topic?

Good

5. The writer makes some contribution of thought to the paper or merely summarizes data or publications?

Good

6. The writer introduces and documents sources adequately and appropriately?

Good

7. The formatting of the manuscript is in accordance to the prescribed paper format?

Good

8. The paragraphs and sentences are cohesive (flow together smoothly without disruption in the train of thought)?

Good

9. Are there any grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors?

No