

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_103855
Title of the Manuscript:	Student Character in the Use of Learning Technology
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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Is the article important for the scientific community? (The article cannot be published in this esteemed journal, it should be supported by articles related to sampling, methodology, validity, reliability and worldwide relevance for the scientific community. It is very inadequate).</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (due diligence was made according to the content of the article and concluded with a single question. "The effect of friends and school management on technology use", the suggested title can be with the change of the whole article).</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is inadequate in terms of method, findings and conclusion.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the article are inadequate.</p> <p>5. I don't think the manuscript is scientifically accurate. It is insufficient in terms of sample and methodology to be a scientific study.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient in terms of subject and content. In addition, the author cited 7 references in the article. However, he cited 17 references in the references. The author sent the article to your journal without checking it. References are not written according to the required method.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract is insufficient, discussion cannot be with 2 sources. The results cannot be concluded from the questions asked in the content.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>No permission was obtained for the questions in the article, and the study was not based on voluntary participation (Helsinki Protocol). The questions were found insufficient for the subject content.</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mine Gul
Department, University & Country	Kocaeli University, Turkey