

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_109746
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact and benefits of the e-system for administration management in primary and secondary schools for teachers and parents
Type of the Article	Review Article

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. YES. The research is relevant to this age of high level human interaction with computers. The research is useful for school administrators to encourage them to maximize the potential of technology in school management.</p> <p>2. Topic is okay.</p> <p>3. The abstract is fair, not adequately written. Abstract should not be paragraphed and should preferably be in past tense. The abstract should include brief discussion about the methodology, findings and recommendations.</p> <p>4. Okay</p> <p>5. Yes, but the hypotheses were not statistically tested and discussed. They were explained descriptively, the tools used (ANOVA, T-test, Chi-square) were not clearly stated.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but not recent. The Author(s) should include recent references between 2013 and 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The researcher(s) should avoid short paragraphs, a paragraph should have a minimum of three sentences. Hypotheses 3 and 4 are not properly stated. The researcher(s) should avoid the use of future tense like "we will" as though the paper is a proposal paper The methodology is too long. Irrelevant information should be removed Other corrections and suggestions are indicated in the reviewed document 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is okay 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adeloye Adebayo Abiodun
Department, University & Country	Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria