

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_98683 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Challenges and Prospects of E-learning in Bangladesh- A Review |
| Type of the Article | Review 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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) |
|---|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | Reviewer's comment 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? The manuscript is important for Bangladesh and some countries that have obstacles in accessing formal education. This paper studies obstacles Bangladesh's education must overcome. And adopt e-learning for effectiveness. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes, it is suitable. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The author presents well. Rather, it should be classified as a systematic review and presented as a point of a systematic review, which may be added to this paper. For example; Problem formulation, Data collection, assessing the studies, data synthesis, and the interpretation of results. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? This review has supporting reference documents, making it reliable. But it would be great if it was presented as a point. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. The references of this study are sufficient and recent. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, it is. | |
| Optional/General 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) |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Rungrudee Klaharn |
| Department, University & Country | Srinakarinwirot University, Thailand |