

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_105874
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Students perceived preparedness for e- Learning in Ibadan, Nigeria
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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. Manuscript presents a descriptive study, circumscribed to a unique centre of training of teachers for health sciences, and with the only perspective provided by students. As such, it's no generalizable in any way, although could be use as source of information for decision makers.</p> <p>2. The title correctly describes the content of the report.</p> <p>3. In general, it is. However, Conclusions section presents some recommendations that don't follow from de evidence collected.</p> <p>4. Structure is correct. Materials and Methods section presents an incomplete information about the questionnaire used. I suggest: a) Including some arguments to explain its construction, in particular the role of sociodemographic data of participants. Besides, meaning of acronyms and levels of study that appear should be given. b) Modifying format of Table 4, in a way that makes it clear which were the questions formulated to participants (Table 2 and 3 fulfil this requirement).</p> <p>5. Manuscript doesn't present mistakes, except for Conclusions section, where authors make suggestions that are don't seem justified by analysis of data, which should be eliminated or modified showing how they are deduced from data. However, it just describes data collected with a questionnaire, that was proposed only to students of a unique centre of studies. So, its scope is limited. The problem that authors are interested can be viewed also by teachers or administrators, among others. I suggest arguing why other relevant agents were excluded from this study.</p> <p>6. Yes, they are.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it, is	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	At the beginning of page 3, authors say that questionnaire has five section, but it has four.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Uruguay, Uruguay