

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128047
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect Of Internet Usage On The Academic Achievement Of Secondary Students
Type of the Article	Research Paper

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is a good topic to do the research work. But some cautions are very much needed. After some corrections it will be able to publish.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is ok	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statement of problem is not mentioned exactly.</li> <li>2. In second null hypothesis "not" word is missing.</li> <li>3. In review of lit. salutation like "Dr." not needed. If 2 or more authors are there, have to use "&amp;" and have to write only the surname of author/authors.</li> <li>4. Directly inserted the descriptive tables (table 1 &amp; 2) without any description.</li> <li>5. In table 3 &amp; 4 fonts are not in similar manner.</li> <li>6. In table 3 heading of table should be "hypothesis" in place of "hypotheses".</li> <li>7. Value of <b>df</b> never be in decimal. But in table 5 written in decimal.</li> <li>8. In table 6 no need to give 2 tables for correlation. Only 1 table is sufficient.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not properly references given, some are missing. In addition some literatures are too old	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is ok	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	After some corrections it will be publishable.	

#### 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:	Saroj Nayyar
Department, University & Country	Kalinga University, India