Paper: **"Navigating Digital Transformation in E-learning at Bangladesh's Tertiary Level: Prospects and Challenges"**

Corresponding Author: Fahmida Haque

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohamed Gomaa Elmorsy Agwa
Faculty of Educational Studies, The National Egyptian E-Learning University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Josphine Kagwiria
Mount Kenya University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: James Nweah-Ackah Mochiah
Holy Child College of Education, Ghana

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Josephine Kagwiria Kirimi	
University/Country: Mount Kenya University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/04/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/04/2025
Manuscript Title: **Digital Transformation for E-learning at the Tertiary Level in Bangladesh: Prospects and Challenges**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES You approve; this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is largely effective, but slight adjustments can enhance clarity, engagement, and appeal while ensuring it accurately reflects the content and scope of the research-possible suggestions of alternative titles are; 1. "E-learning Transformation in Tertiary Education in Bangladesh: Opportunities and Challenges" 2. "Navigating Digital Transformation in E-learning at Bangladesh's Tertiary Level: Prospects and Challenges"	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**

The article provides a comprehensive examination of the digital transformation landscape in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Bangladesh. The author effectively contextualizes the necessity of digitalization in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, noting that online education has gained traction even post-pandemic. The abstract clearly outlines the research's aim, methodology through mixed methods, and the key findings regarding challenges faced by HEIs.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The document needs to be edited though not major but need to be attended to	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The use of Mixed Method Research (MMR) is appropriate given the multifaceted nature of the data required to assess digital transformation. The blend of qualitative and quantitative approaches allows for a richer understanding of the challenges and opportunities facing HEIs. However, aspects such as the convenience sampling method and the relatively small sample size (100 students and 10 teachers) should be addressed with caution, as they may impact the generalizability of the findings.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The findings present a detailed picture of the challenges faced by HEIs in implementing digital education. Issues around digital literacy, inadequate infrastructure, financial constraints, and limited access to resources resonate as critical barriers. The study effectively highlights these challenges, providing a nuanced understanding of the situation in Bangladesh. Additionally, the mention of a "digital maturity" framework is an innovative suggestion that could provide HEIs with a roadmap for assessing and enhancing their digital strategies. This aspect of the findings is particularly noteworthy, as it seeks to offer actionable insights rather than just a critique of existing challenges.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
the results and discussion section of this article makes substantial contributions to understanding the current landscape of digital transformation in higher education in Bangladesh. It provides actionable insights that can guide institutional policies and strategies going forward. The complexity and interrelatedness of challenges highlighted warrant further research and prompt institutional reflection on their current practices, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness of digital education. Literature review was adequately applied across the findings	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Encourage the authors to engage critically with the references they cite. It's useful not just to list studies but also to discuss their findings and relevance to the current research, thereby showcasing the authors' understanding of the literature.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed X	X Accepted with minor corrections
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Consider expanding the sample size or incorporating a diverse range of institutions to enhance the generalizability of the findings.
2. Provide specific case studies or examples of successful digital transformation initiatives within the context of Bangladeshi HEIs.
3. Discuss more in-depth the role of government and policy frameworks in supporting the digital transformation of higher education.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title "Digital Transformation for E-learning at the Tertiary Level in Bangladesh: Prospects and Challenges" is clear, concise, and directly reflects the core focus of the article. It appropriately captures the scope, geographic context, and thematic direction of the research. Therefore, it is both adequate and well-aligned with the content of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract effectively presents the objectives, methodology, and key findings of the study. It succinctly outlines the research focus on identifying challenges to digital transformation in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Bangladesh, and clearly mentions the use of a mixed methods approach. The results are summarized in a structured and coherent way, highlighting major challenges and proposed solutions. Overall, the abstract is clear, informative, and aligned with the main body of the article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
While the article is generally well-written and clearly structured, there are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the text. These issues, though minor, can affect the overall readability and academic tone of the paper. A thorough proofreading and copy-editing pass is recommended to enhance clarity, coherence, and professionalism.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The study employs a Mixed Methods Research (MMR) approach, which is clearly explained and appropriate for the research objectives. The data collection techniques—including written survey questionnaires and interviews—are well described. The sampling method, participant demographics, and analytical tools (such as descriptive statistics and Likert scale analysis) are also clearly presented. Overall, the methodology is sufficiently detailed and suitable for addressing both qualitative and quantitative research questions.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is well-organized, coherent, and clearly written. Each section flows logically, with appropriate transitions between the introduction, results, discussion, and conclusion. The arguments are supported with data, charts, and references, enhancing the credibility of the findings. With the exception of a few minor grammatical issues mentioned earlier, the content is free from major errors and effectively communicates the research outcomes.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion is accurate, relevant, and well-supported by the content of the paper. It effectively synthesizes the main findings, reiterates the core challenges identified in the study, and aligns with the research objectives outlined at the beginning. The recommendations provided are practical and directly address the issues discussed throughout the paper, making the conclusion both coherent and impactful.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
GOOD

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear and adequately reflects the content of the article. It communicates both the subject (digital transformation in tertiary e-learning) and the context (Bangladesh), while indicating a balanced focus on prospects and challenges.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well-structured and clearly presents the study's objectives (exploring challenges in digitalization of HEIs in Bangladesh), methods (Mixed Method Research), and key findings (challenges and proposed solutions).

However, the results section could be slightly more concise to avoid redundancy. It could be enhanced with more quantitative specifics (e.g., sample size or result percentages).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article is generally readable, but there are several grammatical issues and stylistic inconsistencies, including:

- Punctuation errors.
- Spacing issues.
- Some awkward or unidiomatic phrasing.
- Verb tense shifts and agreement issues.

Needs grammar/spell check and style editing.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The Mixed Method Research approach is clearly described.

Sampling methods (100 students, 10 teachers), tools (questionnaires and interviews), participant profiles, and analytical techniques (descriptive statistics, thematic analysis) are all specified.

Descriptive statistics, Likert scales, and thematic analysis are properly mentioned.

However, it could benefit from:

- More detail on interview questions or survey design.
- Justification for the sample size (e.g., why 100 students/10 teachers?)

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The article follows a logical structure, with clear sections (Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion). The results are presented with charts and tables, enhancing clarity. Results are visualized through charts and tables, and discussion aligns with the data. Minor issues include repetitive phrasing.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion summarizes findings well and offers realistic recommendations, supported by data and literature.

Reduce repetition in findings and discussion sections. Some statements could be more concise.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list is comprehensive, includes both local (Bangladesh-specific) and international literature, and covers key authors and models (e.g., digital maturity).

A few formatting inconsistencies exist (e.g., spacing or punctuation around DOIs and retrieval dates, inconsistent use of "&" vs. "and").

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Needs revision for grammar (some parts substantial grammatical revision), some formatting and style inconsistencies. Avoiding repetition, and further synthesis of key points.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes
The title is clear
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The ABSTRACT was clearly presented.
But some aspects of the methods need to be added.
Population and Sampling technique used
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
There are few grammatical errors
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes
But the author need to describe the population for the study. Also, the sampling technique and procedure must be described.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear but contains few errors
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
I couldn't see conclusion section.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Good work but you need to address these issues.
1. Include population and Sampling method in the ABSTRACT.
2. In the methodology section, describe the Sampling method used.
3. Describe the instrument used for the data collection (who developed the instrument, how many items and section, what is the reliability co-efficient, etc)
4. As it stands, the is no conclusion section in the work. Get the heading for CONCLUSION.