

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102422
Title of the Manuscript:	E-learning Challenges faced by the primary school teachers: A study from Taif, Saudi Arabia
Type of the 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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is very interesting for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article is suitable for the journal 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, under the study design, the author(s) needs to provide the sampling design(s) utilized in obtaining the sample size. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. Author(s) should follow the guidelines as stipulated by the journal. That is, introduction, materials and methods, etc. As a result of that, author(s) should merge the problem statement as part of the introduction. Again, objectives and research questions should be incorporated into prose instead of being presented as stand-alone text. The literature lacks methodological review (such as sample size, type of analysis conducted, and findings) from the various cited literatures utilized in the study. Example, Martinez et al. (2019) focused on using mobile devices to improve Learning Outcomes and Teachers' Professional development (what was the sample size used, what type of analysis was done, and what was their finding?) Please provide a comprehensive and a critical literature review. 5. The manuscript reads like an academic paper (e.g., thesis or dissertation) much more than a journal article. The author(s) should revise to ensure that the paper's tone is appropriate for a journal article and thus follows the guidelines of the journal. The author(s) is also encouraged to review the feature articles in past issues of the journal as exemplars of the appropriate tone and format. Again, there is inconsistency regarding the objectives and research questions. That is, the manuscript has 4 objectives, yet 5 research questions. 6. Manuscript somewhat lacks in-text citations. However, most of the references are old and needs to be revised to suit current years of not more than 5 years counting from 2023. Again, there is discrepancy in the referencing style of this manuscripts. There's APA and other style. The author(s) should see APA guidelines regarding the order of references and revise as necessary. 7. The author(s) should avoid the use of the ambiguous term "this". Also review for other similarly ambiguous terms like those, these, that, they, their, them, it, etc. Revise as necessary throughout the document. 8. The author(s) should ensure the abbreviation complies with APA guidelines. Example, write SPSS in full for the first time and abbreviate later in the manuscript. 9. In the methodology, the author(s) failed to state the sampling design utilized in determining the sample size. Again, the research design was missing. Again, the five-point scale was utilised as stated by the author(s). However, the author(s) failed to state the parameters of the five-point likert scale in the manuscript. This study involved 154 EFL Primary School teachers according to the author(s). The question is, out of what population did the author(s) gain the 154 EFL teachers. Again, what technique was used to calculate or determine the sample size? Since the present work adapted a questionnaire used in the Saudi context, it was not 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>required to test validity again – This statement is false from the author(s). It is necessary for the author(s) to state how validity was determined.</p> <p>10. The discussion of the study is poorly written. Discussion should be reflective of the literature review. This was clearly missing.</p> <p>11. Limitations of the study should form a part of the research methodology</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality is suitable for scholarly communications, however, the manuscript has so many grammatical errors and needs to be attended corrected and proofread.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author(s) should pay much attention to the research methodology. The author(s) should include the study measure</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samuel Krampah
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana