

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJASS_120942</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Information Literacy Indicators in Relation to Postgraduate Students' Research Productivity in Public Universities in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>		
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract is somewhat dense with statistical terminology, which might be challenging for readers unfamiliar with these terms. Consider simplifying or briefly explaining these terms.</li> <li>• In introduction there is a slight redundancy in the explanation of the importance of information literacy. Streamlining this section could improve clarity.</li> <li>• The hypotheses could be more clearly linked to the specific objectives to avoid any potential confusion.</li> <li>• The literature review, although thorough, lacks a critical analysis of the sources. It tends to summarize rather than critique the existing literature.</li> <li>• There are instances where the connection between reviewed literature and the current study is weak or implied rather than explicitly stated.</li> <li>• The methodology section, while detailed, lacks clarity in describing the sampling method. The justification for using total enumeration sampling could be more robust.</li> <li>• There is insufficient detail on the data collection process, such as how participants were recruited and how data were managed and stored.</li> <li>• The choice of statistical methods is appropriate but not sufficiently justified. Explaining why these methods were selected over others would enhance transparency.</li> <li>• While the findings are clearly presented, the discussion of the weak association with the ability to evaluate information sources is underdeveloped. Further exploration of this finding is necessary.</li> <li>• The discussion section could be more critical. It tends to accept the findings at face value without considering alternative explanations or potential biases.</li> <li>• There is insufficient acknowledgment of the study's limitations. Discussing these limitations and their impact on the findings would provide a more balanced view.</li> <li>• There is a slight disconnect between the conclusion and the broader implications of the study. Emphasizing the study's contribution to the field would strengthen the conclusion.</li> </ul> <p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The manuscript occasionally suffers from minor grammatical and typographical errors, which can distract from the content. A thorough</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>proofreading is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The professional tone is generally maintained, but there are sections where the writing becomes overly technical or jargon heavy.</li> <li>• Some sections of the manuscript could benefit from more precise and concise language to improve clarity and flow.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>		
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>R. K. Kishore Patnal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kirloskar Institute of Advanced Management Studies, India</b>