



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Lived Experiences of Pre-Services Teachers in the Practice Teaching Using Technology-Based Pedagogy and Interactive Digital Tools
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper addresses a relevant area in teacher education, but the methodological identity of the study is not yet convincing. The manuscript repeatedly presents itself as phenomenological, while the actual analysis and reporting read more like a general thematic qualitative study.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The analysis mainly describes repeated reading, coding, categorizing, and clustering responses into themes, but it does not show a clear phenomenological analytic process for moving from individual accounts toward the essential meaning of the experience. More critically, the discussion presents broad claims about transformation, resilience, professional identity, empowerment, cognitive adaptation, and instructional evolution, yet these interpretations are not visibly anchored in the participants' actual narratives. Some themes also appear conceptually constructed at a level much higher than what the reported analytic procedure can clearly support. As written, the paper asks the reader to accept several strong interpretations without showing enough qualitative evidence of how these meanings emerged from the participants' lived accounts.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I appreciate reading this manuscript. It addresses a highly relevant topic in modern education. The manuscript provides valuable insights into the experiences of future educators.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title Section The manuscript title contains grammatical errors. Specifically, the phrase Pre Services Teacher's requires correction. Consider a revision to emphasize practice instruction with technology based pedagogy. This change improves clarity and removes the possessive error.
Abstract Section The abstract provides a good overview of the research. I notice the abstract appears twice. Please remove the duplicate paragraph. While you mention interactive digital tools, the abstract would benefit from explicit mention of one or two specific tools for context.
Keywords Section The keywords are relevant. Ensure they are alphabetized per the journal guidelines.
Introduction Section The connection to Sustainable Development Goal 4 is excellent. You state there is a limited number of qualitative studies. I recommend you expand on what specific gaps your study fills compared to the cited works like Tondeur et al..
Methodology Section You selected five participants. For a phenomenological study, you must justify this sample size. Explain how you achieved data saturation with five individuals. You mention the instrument obtained a mean validation score of 4.76. Detail the scale utilized for this score to provide context.
Results Section The manuscript mentions Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3, but no actual figures are shown. If these are intended to be figures, thematic maps, conceptual frameworks, or charts, please insert the corresponding visual presentations. If no visual figure is intended, remove the figure labels. For the presentation of findings, clearly identify each theme and explain what the theme represents. Under each theme, include at least three actual participant responses or verbatim excerpts that directly support the theme. Each response should be properly labeled using the participant code or number.
Discussion Section



The discussion blends results and literature heavily. It is best to clearly separate the specific discoveries from the literature support. In Theme 1, you cite Ertmer & Ottenbreit Leftwich et al.. This citation is incorrect because there are only two authors; the et al. is unnecessary. Under Theme 2, you list specific platforms like Google Classroom, Quizizz, Kahoot!, Canva, Prodigy, and Epic!. It would be helpful to briefly explain how the participants utilized these specific tools to address technical failures.

Conclusion Section

The conclusion is brief and accurately reflects the main points. To strengthen this section, add a brief recommendation for future research or specific policy changes based on your discoveries.

Acknowledgment Section

The acknowledgments are thorough and well structured. No changes are necessary here.

Conflict of Interest Section

This section is clear and standard.

References Section

There is a duplicate entry for Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. 2020. Please remove the incomplete duplicate. Some entries lack spaces after publication years or have misplaced punctuation.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			