

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_82166
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Undergraduates and Postgraduates pertaining online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic: a Cross-sectional Study amongst Sudanese Health Professional Students
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Introduction: Author may review and include previous students' perceptions towards online learning, does not necessary during Covid-19. Author may include the definition of perception in this manuscript. Overall, nothing indicates the meaning of positive or negative perception whether from previous study nor author perspective for this paper.2. Methodology: Author should describe how the online learning was conducted amongst the students. Is there any difference of implementation between undergraduates and postgraduates' students?3. Results: Authors write about positive and negative perceptions however, without clear definition of this terms, misunderstand may easier happen amongst reader.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Results: Author may write the results in a form of Table to make it easy to read and include the number of students for each percentage may help reader understand the difference of samples for each statement.2. Grammar and sentence structure for whole manuscript can still be improved to make it easier to read. Some sentence was left hanging leads to unclear delivery of meaning.3. Not sure how the formatting of this paper and this journal, however, some correction should be done to the writing format. For example, citation was put after full stop in manuscript (Eg: Page 3).	
Optional/General comments	This is an interesting study and authors have collected a dataset that will contributed to literature review on online learning particularly during Covid-19. However, the paper has some shortcomings in regard to some introduction, methodology and presentation of data. I have provided remarks on particular elements of this paper. Given this shortcomings the manuscript requires minor revisions.	

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:	Elnethra Folly Eldy
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia