

Eleni-Nefeli Pippa
Kim Reichert
Tom Dykins
George Batty

Meta-Review

Tan, J., & Biswas, G. (2006, January). The role of feedback in preparation for future learning: A case study in learning by teaching environments. In Intelligent Tutoring Systems (pp. 370-381). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- We all agreed that despite the fact that the text was easy to read, it was not suitable for someone who does not have experience in the specific topic or readers who did not have a practical experience of the program (Betty's Brain). However, we agreed that this paper presented in an easy way some examples of the work that has been done in this field.
- We also agreed that it was not clear all the time, if the authors were examining the current or a previous study, something that confused us.
- Moreover, all the reviewers were confused by the description of the different feedback approaches. In many cases we found it quite difficult to understand clearly the differences between the different approaches.
- One point in which we did not agree is the lack of a control group. One reviewer argues that the control group was not necessary because the paper compared three different approaches. On the other hand, the rest of the reviewers argued that a control group would have been helpful, in order to extract more accurate results.
- However, we all agreed that the design of the experiments was confusing, as the time and content of the feedback approaches were not separated and we believed that that could affect the results.
- From our point of view, neither the prediction or the results were presented clearly enough, and that was very confusing. We could not understand how the authors predict the results and how these predictions were confirmed by the experiments.
- Finally, regarding the conclusion of the paper, we agreed that the differences between the results of the different approaches were not significant and therefore, no safe conclusions can be extracted from these results.
- All in all, all the reviewers agreed to a weak rejection of the paper.