

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97894
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL ICT CURRICULUM IN GRADE NINE: A CASE OF TRASHIGANG DZONGKHAG
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>The manuscript is important in content and scientifically adequate.</p> <p>The title is suitable, however, ICT should be written in full since abbreviations are not advisable in the title.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Most subsections should be done away with to reduce the article to recommended length. I suggest the article to adopt the following format without any other subtitles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title 2. Abstract 3. Background to the study 4. Statement of the problem 5. Objectives (this is optional since they will have been mentioned in the abstract) 6. Literature Review 7. Methodology 8. Findings/Results 9. Conclusion 10. Recommendations 11. References <p>Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient but Wikipedia should be removed since it is not an academic source for research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is scholarly.</p>	
<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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David Wafula Lwangale
Department, University & Country	Koitaleel Samoei University College, Kenya