

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_97246
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS AND ATTITUDE OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS ON THE USE OF SOCIAL STUDIES APPS FOR TEACHING
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.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>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 paper is suitable for scientific community especially the target respondent (teachers)</p> <p>The title is suitable for the article Abstract will be comprehensive if the author states the contribution of study clearly. Introduction / Problem statement / objectives - Please provide statistics to support most of the points here. The title/topic, scope and objectives of the manuscript are adequately defined. Clear objectives and problem statement need to be discussed before the LR part. Sound work which expresses a coherent position only in broad terms and in uncritical conformity to one or more standard views of the topic. Very general discussion of the problems/issues. Need to provide more specific issues that affecting the use of social studies apps for teaching. Suggest to simplify the objectives of the study. The terms used are too basic and general. LR - Some up-to-date and/or appropriate literature used. Goes beyond the material tutor has provided. Limited use of sources to support a point. A basic overview of the literature, with limited interpretation and application. Limited past research is presented, or research presented is not relevant to the topic. Citations are not presented in the correct format. This manuscript is moderately relevant and will make a nominal contribution to the field. Conceptual / theoretical framework should be provided as well to convey the direction of study. Some attempt to construct a coherent argument, but may suffer loss of focus and consistency, with issues at stake stated only vaguely, or theoretical mode(s) couched in simplistic terms. Relevant Theories also need to be discussed in this part. Methods - Satisfactory understanding of the significance of the research and a reasonably effective interpretation and application of the methodology. Arguments presented have minor flaws. There is some weakness in interpretation. Demonstrates an above average ability to articulate a critical response and an above average analysis of material. Results and Discussion - Demonstrates adequate levels of understanding and originality in the analysis of the research findings. There is limited evidence of personal insights into the field. The research findings make a minor contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline and field of study. Some analytical treatment, but may be prone to description. Conclusion - Discussion is sufficient with few errors. Conclusions are based on a detailed examination of outcomes and appropriate for study. The conclusions are partially logical and/or valid. They are communicated clearly. The final summary only partially communicates the purpose and findings of the study. References - The referencing has been done in a proper manner but There are, however, a number of inconsistencies. Please check again.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A simple basic style but with significant deficiencies in expression or format that may pose obstacles for the reader</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Seen as a whole, the manuscript is of an acceptable academic standard and deserves an average mark. Less serious revision/editing is required.</p>	

Comment [KR1]: Demonstrates adequate levels of understanding and originality in the analysis of the research findings. There is limited evidence of personal insights into the field. The research findings make a minor contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline and field of study. Some analytical treatment, but may be prone to description.

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:	Kamalesh Ravesangar
Department, University & Country	Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology, Malaysia

