

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_101368
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of Digital Tools: Critical Analysis of College and University Professors in Tamilnadu
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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, it is.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes, it is</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections of results should be added to the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The discussion section should effectively advance the themes that the manuscript sets out to address. Suggestion: Provide more specific research questions then integrate the literature with the finding to provide a coherent argument in favor of the proposed research provided. Conclusion section should be expanded to highlight the unique contributions of the manuscript and limitations of the research. It should include all main results in compact form, comments and their implications. The finding should be related to results from previous literature. The discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the research findings contribute to new knowledge.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>The literature review should relate to the research questions and points of emphasis. Much more critical analysis needs to be undertaken of the relevant literature and key points/issues identified which will underpin the rest of the manuscript. Try to include some latest journal article references published from 2020-2023 in the specific areas to improve the relevance and currency of the research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is. The overall score of English quality of the article with Grammarly Software is 86 with the link: https://app.grammarly.com/ddocs/2074715225</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Our suggestion is that the manuscript needs more convincing arguments and documentation of the originality and the value of this particular research. In addition to this, it also needs a coherent presentation and interpretation of the findings and provide an argument that supports the significance of the research in comparison to what is already known about this research problem.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arita Marini
Department, University & Country	Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia