



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics .
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_51301
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) IN THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITY OF BENIN POST GRADUATE STUDENTS
Type of the Article	

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>)

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	<p>The work done is interesting, well presented, and in general, presents a good originality and proposal both methodological and practical. However, I believe that there are some aspects that should be resolved before they can be published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction includes quite a few references to related work that should be moved, in an orderly and effective way, to section 2, which suffers from a complete systematic review of solutions similar to the one proposed by the authors. In general, I believe that this systematic review of other similar proposals should also be used as a common thread in the evaluation, comparing the results in specific scenarios obtained by the authors' proposal and others existing in the market and in the more academic world. - The evaluation should include a much more detailed description of the sample to be studied, with its descriptive characteristics. - It would include a discussion section on the threats to the validation carried out (internal, external threats, etc.) in order to increase the validity of this section. - The conclusions are too brief. I think the authors can improve this part. 	Noted with thanks
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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>	