

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_99024
Title of the Manuscript:	The Strengths and Drawbacks of E-Resources in Higher Education
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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)	The manuscript is important for scientific community of higher education institutions. The title suits the article. The abstract misses the methodology and stating clearly the findings on strengths and drawbacks. The sections of the manuscript misses the problem statement and objectives of the study. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The references need to be improved according to the guidelines. The other issues are in the presentation of findings. These ought to show the frequency of the people who gave the strengths and drawbacks. Separation of presentation and discussion of findings is important.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English language suits academic communication.	
Optional/General comments	The research gap need to clearly come out in the introduction and literature.	

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:	Kakooza Victoria
Department, University & Country	Kyambogo University, Uganda