

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_107996
Title of the Manuscript:	Opinions of B.Ed Students in the Cuddalore district of Tamil Nadu about e-learning Materials for the Subject of Understanding Disciplines and School Subjects
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The paper is quite simple. It underscored perceptions (opinions) of students about the e-learning materials in a particular subject. May be this is more of evaluation by students towards improving the instructional materials.</p> <p>I suggest that the title be revised into this: Students' perspective on e-learning materials in understanding discipline and school subjects: an input to instructional material enhancement It could have been better if the abstract is freely flowing following the sequence: rationale/objectives, methodology, significant findings and recommendations. Yes, it is.</p> <p>It could have been better if there is a triangulation (i.e., qualitative methods) to verify results from quantitative data.</p> <p>Beef up literature review. More studies to be included over the last 5 years.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, but it is highly recommended that the manuscript be proofread and undergo stylistics and editing and grammar checked.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dennis G. Caballes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Graduate Program School of Teacher Education, The National Teachers College, Philippines</b>