



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_47712
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Militating against Effective Teaching and Learning of Computer in Secondary Schools in Enugu State Nigeria
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The issue this report is about is an interesting one. Antecedents that are referred constitute an adequate conceptual framework for the study. Methodological choices are also consistent with the purposes of this inquiry. However, aspects that that follow must be presented in a more detailed way: 1) Nothing is said about the construction of the questionnaire. An explanation could argue on the process that led to a classification of items in four factors, and also inform if questionnaire was object of any study (interjudge reliability, alpha de Crombach, or others) 2) It is interesting to know how many teachers and how many students answered the questionnaire and how was it administrated (in person, collectively or others). Besides, if any disaggregation has been made between this two groups to study eventual differences in their opinions, it must be mentioned. If not, explain the reason for not to it would be interesting. 3) Data displayed in any of the tables don't imply as a conclusion what is presented as such. At most, these are opinions about the issue, and not evidences. So, I suggest to pay attention to modify redaction of paragraphs following each table, and first paragraph of conclusions and recommendations.	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud
Department, University & Country	Universidad Católica del Uruguay (UCU), Uruguay