

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_123463
Title of the Manuscript:	Reconnoitering the Correlation between ICT Facilities Application and Capacity Building of Library Staff in University Libraries in South-South, Nigeria
Type of the 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 <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	With the growing influence of technology in today's life, it is but inevitable to go with the flow of computer advancement. The innovations brought about by technology is evident in all walks of life including in the professional setting, even in libraries. This manuscript is vital in the research world for it adds to the available resources supporting the importance of technology in the library. It also shows the correlation between ICT facilities application and capacity building which in a sense, work hand in hand for with ICT is an ever-growing innovation which calls for an up-to-date skillset and knowledge.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is relevant and accurate since it conveys the purpose and the content of the study. Though, it s suggested to use easy to understand words in the title to make it easier for the readers to grasp the content of the study. I find the word "Reconnoitering" irrelevant to the title since the title "The Correlation Between ICT Facilities Application and Capacity Building of Library Staff in University Libraries in South-South, Nigeria" is sufficient enough. But if the researcher/s really want to include it in the title proper look for anther word which is easier to understand.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensively written for it provides all the necessary information and results of the study. I suggested to keep the abstract as it is.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>In the INTRODUCTION part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I suggest to choose between 1.1 or 1.2, but 1.2 is highly recommended since 1.1 and 1.2 are synonymous in content it's just that they are presented differently. In addition, you can already know the objective of the study by looking at the Research Questions. <p>In the REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2.3 is not in irrelevant to the study, it is suggested to incorporate it in 2.2 or 2.4 to avoid confusion to the readers. <p>In the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is suggested that the discussion of the findings should be right after the presented table so as not to make confusion and to make the discussion more specific. The discussion should also be supported by related studies whether they support or negate the result of the study. <p>Please use Arabic Numerals in the RECOMMENDATIONS part for uniformity.</p>	
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.	Since they use correlation, it is evident that they used the method well. It is shown that the level of significance is also presented well. The study is scientifically robust since the number of respondents is vast which helps the study more accurate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references (2018 and below) are not within the 5-Year recency publication date. It is suggested to use recent references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English is easy to understand but it is suggested to go over one more time to check for some minor sentence errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Rico B. Orenia
Department, University & Country	Anglo Singapore International School, Philippines