

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_98198
Title of the Manuscript:	Learning and Communication Technologies: Future of Viable Education
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The issue of the article is very important but it isn't understandable nor follow the rules of a scientific article. Yes The abstract is comprehensive. No... it is not clear what the authors want! No, the methodology isn't clear, and the results aren't well described yes. The authors should review the methodology to explain what methodology they choose to analyse the articles; they also must clarify the articles they found to analyse. The results seem to be missed... or aren't well explained.... The sub-sections of the article aren't clear. The introduction is poor and should be revised. There are several phases that aren't comprehensible.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English must be reviewed	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rosa BrancaTracana
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic of Guarda, Portugal