

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_124335
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF FACEBOOK USEFULNESS IN COVID-19 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION IN ANAMBRA STATE
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is evaluating a general question which is of utmost importance for our society as far as the role of social media is concerned. BUT improvement is required in this article especially regarding the REFERENCES.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Appropriate Title</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract- Good</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections written well but demands corrections at various places, shortcomings are listed below.</p>	
<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.</p>	<p>Not able to correlate references. In the text references are quoted in numbers (total 33 references) whereas in the references section only 23 references are there which are listed in Harvard style referencing but not in alphabetical order.</p> <p>Can't find reference number 16 listed on page no. 7</p> <p>Can't find Asika, cited in [15] listed on page no. 8</p> <p>Must be written in past tense (page no 9) - Two research assistants will be recruited by the researcher to help with the study. The assistants are graduates of Mass Communication resident in the state capitals where the study was carried out.</p> <p>Couldn't interpret (page 16)- <u>29 percent of respondents (n=109) were exposed to Facebook to seek information on Covid-19 pandemic very often</u>, 41 percent (n=157) did so often, 10 percent (n=70) did so sometimes, 4 percent (n=14) did so rarely while <u>6 percent (n=22) did so very often</u></p> <p>Contradictory statement (page 25)- Result shows that chi square test for hypothesis 3 has a P value is 0.205 and this P value is less than the critical value of 0.05.</p> <p>DISCUSSION COULDN'T BE EVALUATED BECAUSE UNABLE TO CROSSCHECK REFERENCES</p> <p>Conclusion is written twice.</p> <p>STUDY IS GOOD BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT IN LISTING & CROSSCHECKING REFERENCES.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Not able to correlate references. In the text references are quoted in numbers (total 33 references) whereas in the references section only 23 references are there which are listed in Harvard style referencing but not in alphabetical order. CANNOT BE CROSSCHECKED Must add some more recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinita Ghosliya
Department, University & Country	Dr. Sampurnanand Medical College, Jodhpur, India