Exploring Factors of Middle School Teachers' Satisfaction 2 with Online Training for Sustainable Professional Development under the Impact of COVID-19

1. This manuscript explores the factors affecting teachers' online training satisfaction and their relationships. The sample are middle school teachers. The main contribution of the manuscript is understanding teachers' satisfaction with online teaching and suggestions on how to improve it.
2. The article is generally well-written. However, I observed several areas for improvement in the following aspects:

Introduction

- There is a need to elaborate more regarding problems in online training. For example, the author states, "For example, when teachers use online learning media (such as blogs), they might encounter problems such as a low level of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, technical problems, and a lack of real-time and synchronous interactions…." [Page 2, L55-58]. Perhaps it is good to offer some explanations – for example, why the low level of perceived usefulness? Note that reference 11 was published in 2015, in which online training might be considered new, especially for in-service teachers.
- There is a need to define/conceptualize the term 'sustainable professional development. Also, in what way is online training considered 'sustainable'?

Theoretical Background

- I am still unclear on how ACSI helps explain users' satisfaction. How are the variables related? Kindly provide brief descriptions. For example, user expectations influence user perception of quality, that in turn influences user loyalty.
- With regards to the hypotheses development, it seems that findings from past studies draw inconclusive results [e.g., Xu et al. (2017) vs. Liu and Zhang (2021). As such, kindly explain why H1 was proposed despite these inconclusive findings. The same goes for H4.
- Justifications for proposing H2 and H3 were considered weak because of the scarcity of research in the area. Perhaps the author can revisit the ACSI model to explain the proposed relationships. The same goes for H6.
- The development of H5 is more reasonable based on the past studies cited.
- The author wrote, "Thus, hypothesis 4 (H4), hypothesis 5 (H5), and hypothesis 6 (H6) were proposed." [Page 5, L193-194]. I believe only H5 and H6, not H4].

Methods

- More descriptions of the selection of the teachers are needed. The author mentioned, "Teachers covered a wide range of subjects, grades, ages, and genders" [Page 5, L212-213]. Perhaps it is good to provide some statistics regarding these demographic variables so that readers can understand the setting of the research.
- The instrument section is also in need of more descriptions. For example, what is the rating scale used (strongly disagree – strongly agree? Do they have a midpoint rating (neutral, NA, etc.)? Since the questionnaires were adapted into the Chinese language, brief descriptions of the translation process will be helpful. To be consistent, a sample of items for the Expectation of Online Training Quality should be included.

Results

- Kindly be informed that in my edition, there are a lot of missing references marked by the comments **Error! Reference source not found**. Please check your reference manager.
- Table 3 – kindly indicate what is 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (Strongly Disagree? etc.). Also, what does the number 4.61 represents? Mean for EX? If so, kindly mention it in the text. The same goes for other values. Note: Values of the standard deviation are quite small, indicating a lack of variability in the responses.
- Table 4 – perhaps it is better to provide evidence of the reliability of the measurement and validity of the interpretation using statistics such as the factor loadings, the average variance explained, composite reliability, or the Fornell-Larcker criterion. Correlation analysis is considered weak for the purpose. Kindly refer to APA 7 for writing the fit indices.
- Table 5 – normally, we also provide values for significant results such as $p<.001$*** rather than leaving it blank. Kindly refer to APA 7 for writing p values.

Discussion

- The discussion section mainly consists of references to past studies and interpretations of the results. I would love to see the author making arguments in support of the finding. For example, the author may need to describe how to increase the expectations on the quality and service of the online training resources. How should the materials be presented to get higher expectations of the quality?

Reference

- Kindly cite more recent articles.
- Kindly revisit the reference section. Be consistent – small caps vs. large caps.