

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59368

Title: Bridging the Gap: A Comparative Analysis of Higher Education Challenges in South Korea and England.

Recommendation:

Accept with Major Revisions

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. Summary

The manuscript compares higher education challenges in South Korea and England, covering structure, funding, government policy (Brain Korea 21, Teaching Excellence Framework), access and equity, quality and global competitiveness, and contemporary issues (South Korea's demographic decline, Brexit). It is a descriptive, secondary-source-based comparative analysis.

2. Assessment by Criteria

2.1 Originality (Fair)

No clear original contribution; largely synthesizes existing literature and public data.

Lacks a research question, hypothesis, or analytical framework.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Comparison remains descriptive rather than analytical, offering parallel descriptions rather than genuine comparative analysis.

No engagement with comparative education theory or methodology.

2.2 Technical Quality (Fair)

No methodology section explaining source selection, analytical criteria, or comparative framework.

Analysis is descriptive, not critical; policies presented uncritically.

Wikipedia cited as a source (pp. 4, 5, 7); several references outdated (Kim & Lee, 2004; Atkinson, 2007; Abreu, 2009).

No tables or figures to present comparative data.

Reference list inconsistent and incomplete; some in-text citations missing from list.

Images (Yonsei University, BK21 logo) not referenced or integrated into argument.

2.3 Clarity (Good)

Generally well-organized with clear section headings and logical flow.

Numerous grammatical errors, typos, and awkward phrasings throughout (e.g., "alesoprompted," p. 21; inconsistent citation formats).

Duplicate section number: 4.1 appears twice.

Section numbering inconsistent; unnumbered sections create confusion.

2.4 Significance (Good)

Topic is timely and relevant; comparative focus offers potential policy insights.

Brexit and demographic discussions are pertinent.

Policy implications vague and not clearly derived from analysis.

No engagement with comparative education theory limits scholarly contribution.

Policies discussed largely uncritically, without attention to shortcomings.

3. Key Recommendations

REVIEWER'S REPORT

1. Add a methodology section explaining comparative approach, source selection, and analytical framework.
2. Articulate a clear research question and original contribution.
3. Engage with comparative education theory (e.g., Bereday's model).
4. Deepen analysis beyond description; critically evaluate policies and their consequences.
5. Replace Wikipedia with authoritative sources; update outdated references.
6. Include tables and figures to present comparative data.
7. Add an abstract summarizing purpose, methodology, findings, and implications.
8. Fix grammatical errors, typos, and citation inconsistencies.
9. Integrate or remove images with proper captions and discussion.
10. Correct duplicate section numbering (4.1 appears twice).
11. Move literature review to the beginning or integrate into introduction.
12. Ensure all in-text citations appear in the reference list and vice versa.

4. Recommendation

Decision: Major Revisions Required

Justification: The manuscript addresses a relevant topic but lacks originality, methodological rigor, and analytical depth. It reads as a descriptive report rather than a scholarly research paper. Significant revisions are needed to meet the standards of the International Journal of Advanced Research.

Confidential Comments to the Editor:

The manuscript is descriptive and lacks a clear research question, methodology, and theoretical framework. It cites Wikipedia and contains numerous grammatical errors. I recommend major revisions. If the authors develop a proper analytical framework, engage with comparative education theory, and improve sourcing and writing quality, it could become publishable. The current version requires substantial reworking.