

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126412
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIAL MEDIA HANDLES AND ACQUISITION OF LEARNING RESOURCES AMONG UNDERGRADUATES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF UYO
Type of the Article	1. Original research papers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides empirical evidence on the impact of social media platforms on the acquisition of learning resources among undergraduates. It addresses a significant research gap by exploring the nuanced effects of individual social media platforms within the Nigerian higher education context. I appreciate the manuscript for its comprehensive analysis and practical recommendations, which can inform educational strategies and policies. However, the reliance on self-reported data might introduce bias, and further studies could benefit from a mixed-methods approach to validate the findings.	
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.	The article's abstract is comprehensive, covering objectives, methodology, sample, instruments, key findings, and recommendations. However, it could be improved by clarifying the research design, highlighting key findings more clearly, including the influence of platforms like YouTube, TikTok, Facebook, and WhatsApp, including broader implications for educational institutions and policy makers, and ensuring consistency in terms and grammatical errors.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive research design and rigorous methodology. The use of an ex-post facto research design, along with the validation and reliability testing of the data collection instrument, ensures the accuracy and reliability of the findings. The study's hypotheses are clearly defined and tested using appropriate statistical methods, such as the independent t-test, which adds to the scientific rigor. Additionally, the manuscript provides a thorough literature review, situating the research within the broader academic context and highlighting its contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and relevant sources. Most of the cited works are from the last five years, which ensures that the study is grounded in current research.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and coherent sentences that effectively convey the research findings and arguments. However, there are a few areas where minor improvements could enhance readability and precision. Ensuring consistent use of terms throughout the manuscript, such as "social media handles" versus "social media platforms," would improve clarity. Additionally, a thorough check for grammatical errors and punctuation issues, such as missing commas or periods, is recommended. Simplifying or rephrasing some sentences could also enhance clarity and flow. Finally, defining all technical terms clearly for readers unfamiliar with them would ensure the manuscript is accessible to a broader audience.	
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:	Bala Dhandayuthapani V.
Department, University & Country	University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Oman