

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_103576</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>AUGMENTED REALITY INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY ON STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN ICT IN EDUCATION COURSE, UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### **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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community as it contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the effect of new innovative instructional strategies on performance of students.</p> <p>Yes it is.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>The writer should include a subsection to discuss the theoretical framework on which the instructional strategies he used are</p> <p>The researcher did not give the background to why discussion method is used. The control group would have been taught using the conventional lecture method but the control group was not represented in the data analysis. Only Augmented ICT and discussion method were represented. T-test result should be shown to reflect the control group.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author has done a good job but there is need for clarity. If the aim is to show effect of Augmented ICT then it should reflect the experimental scores for that and control group. Also, if it is a comparative effect of Augmented ICT and discussion method, the significant effect of the two should be on the control group. The control group should have table of mean and standard deviation presented, then t-test on the mean scores of the two instructional strategies and control group should be presented.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Olufunmilayo D. Ayodele</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Osun State University, Nigeria</b>