

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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1) The manuscript is important to the scientific community, especially regarding emerging pedagogy that is facilitated with technology (e.g., applications). This may be especially true in geographic areas that have challenges with access and engagement regarding technology equipment and resources. The successful utilization of technology may have significant positive impacts on student learning and achievement. 2) The title of the article is suitable. 3) The abstract is sufficient for this article. 4) The Aim and Objectives of the Study and the Research Questions sections are redundant and could be one section. The narrative in the Results and Discussion section, especially in regards to the various data tables, could be reduced somewhat. For example, tables could be consolidated to provide a comprehensive look at gender, attitudinal, and awareness differences, which may allow for less text overall. If available, additional narrative in the Conclusion section would help bring about a more balanced manuscript in regards to the various sections. 5) The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. 6) The references are sufficient and fairly recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1) The manuscript could use additional editing (e.g., narrative consolidation, elimination of redundancies) and proofreading (e.g., grammar and formatting) – these are not extensive issues and should be reconciled easily.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael D. Thompson
Department, University & Country	Illinois Wesleyan University, USA