

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_105580
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Social Media on Reading Culture among Nigerian Polytechnic Students
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.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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract needs to be reconsidered as mentioned in 7 below.</p> <p>4. The subsections are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent but need to be re-written following the APA citation system.</p> <p>7. The following are to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Editing is highly required starting from the abstract which sound weak. - The abstract should be one block paragraph, 250-300 word length. - The numbers and percentages that appear in the abstract are not accurate as they do not constitute 100%. - The research gap and the significance are absent in the abstract. - There is no dot after the last word in the keyword list. - The ampersand should '&' be used in the in-text citations as in (Anyira and Udem, 2020). - The lines should be justified. - The references in the reference list should be re-worked following the Citation APA system especially articles published in e-journals. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language needs editing.	
<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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>No</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nawal Fadhil Abbas
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq