

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_123463</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Reconnoitering the Correlation between ICT Facilities Application and Capacity Building of Library Staff in University Libraries in South-South, Nigeria</b>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Paper is importance as it fosters academic excellence by improving service delivery to library users (students) by empowered staff with adequate infrastructure	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1.1 'aims and objectives' - consider deleting aims/ retaining objectives alone	
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.	The methodology used is appropriate and sound, the analysis is ok technically sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient. Consider revising the old references	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	satisfactory	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Minor corrections	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Stanley Kavale
Department, University & Country	Open University of Kenya, Kenya