

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125717
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of ICT Gadgets by Rural Students: A Study of Usage Levels and Correlation with Socio-Demographic Factors
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript is timely, interesting and trending. Since the use of ICT gadgets is very rampant nowadays, it is also interesting to know who it is helpful to students in the rural areas and the challenges they face using the ICT gadgets. However, the research gap was not clearly stated. I am just confused with the data analysis done to treat the demographic factors and the utilization of gadgets. I think ANOVA or t-test should be used.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is ok but it can be made simpler. Utilization of ICT Gadgets as Correlates to Socio-Demographic Factors among Rural Students	
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.	Please add the problems that exists and the research GAP. Methodology should also be enhanced because the research design, instrument/questionnaire that was used was not mentioned. Please add also the recommendation for future research. If the author can limit the abstract into 250 words only.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The author must detail instrument used whether fully adapted from journals or modified or self-constructed. There is enough information for transferability of the research study. The details discussed can be easily followed and the sampling can be replicated and can be modified as well. RESULTS and DISCUSSION: There were no implication of the study discussed.	
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.	Summarized the contextual relevance of the study stating other problems. The table data is well presented, easy to interpret and is understandable for readers. The findings in brief is easy to understand and presented in a wrap. The writing style of the author upholds the relevance of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There were only 8 references, I think it would be better if the author will add more to support the discussions in the manuscript. It would also be better if the references used were up to date.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The writing style of the author upholds the relevance of the study and a careful inclusion of the related literatures must just be reviewed to align with the topic.	
Optional/General comments	I think conclusion should be improved. It should include the purpose of the study, the findings, the limitations faced, and the recommendations especially for future research.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	April M. Obon
Department, University & Country	Adventist University of the Philippines, Philippines