

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_116983
Title of the Manuscript:	The Reasons for Taking Photos instead of Taking Notes in Class among College Students Majoring in Mathematics
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The manuscript describes the current phenomenon of college students majoring in mathematics in learning. Their learning habit in class, namely taking photos, is qualitatively explored. It provides insight about the potential and usage of electronic devices in learning. Therefore, it is in accordance with today's learning context.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. The suggested title is "Exploring the habits of taking photos in class among college students majoring in mathematics"	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract should be revised by re-writing the findings and conclusion in a simple way.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. For introduction section, the "real" problems encountered by college students majoring in mathematics should further describe, to clarify the context of problem to be researched. 2. The section of literature review is absent. 3. For research methods, author(s) should describe clearly about the characteristics of the population and samples (or participant), samples selection method, data analysis technique, and determination of data reliability.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The discussion section should be revised by comparing all claims obtained in the study with the previous studies or theories.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality needs to improve for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

[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:	Lok Wai Foong
Department, University & Country	Teacher Education Institute (Ipoh Campus), Malaysia, Malaysia