

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_90791
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Media Platforms Usage for Learning and Library Services in Selected Higher Learning Institutions in Zanzibar.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The title is a good one for this era of the fourth industrial revolution (4IR) driven by education 4.0; however, the following are critical concerns about the study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author(s) should change the study's title to align with the manuscript.</li> <li>2. The abstract is wordy and does not capture the critical points in the study</li> <li>3. The literature review is a report and did not show an actual literature review for this study</li> <li>4. The methodology is inadequate (the questionnaire has problems, no interview protocol/guide, and the research instruments' validity and reliability are unknown).</li> <li>5. In the result section, the author(s) used some data that are unclear from the table.</li> <li>6. No result of any interview conducted</li> <li>7. The discussion is vague.</li> <li>8. The conclusion discussed Facebook, Twitter, Blogs and WhatsApp, which were never reviewed in the introduction or the literature.</li> <li>9. The study did not present any research question.</li> <li>10. The entire manuscript has many grammar and language errors that require the attention of an English language expert.</li> </ol> <p>Generally, the approach of the author(s) to this title shows that of a rookie scholar in educational research. The title has three keywords that should have been the focus (social media platforms, learning and library services). Instead, the author(s) ultimately ignored learning. Social media was discussed instead of how the various platforms could impact learning and library services in higher institutions. However, despite all these, the author(s) demonstrated some knowledge of educational research, which is commendable. After perusing my comments in the manuscript, I believe a better revision is possible.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes. How the author(s) got the consent of the participants was not indicated.</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aina, Jacob Kola
Department, University & Country	Kwara State College of Education, Nigeria