Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJASS_83417**
Title of the Manuscript:	**IMPACT OF FOOTBALL BETTING ON STUDY HABIT OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA.**
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:

(https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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	• Please include discussions on the present scenario in your schools dealing with students learning practices (study habits), students' attitudes toward learning your courses/subjects, academic standing of your students, and also monitoring (admin and faculty). This will lead you to raise your research problems. • Another issue that I found in your methodology is your process of having 18 students per school for you to have 180 as your sample size. You should include the process of computing your sample size. What did you do to have 180 samples out of 6565? Did you use the Slovin's formula? Or the Lynch's Formula? Or just set it based on your convenience? • You've indicated here that your assessment instrument is composed of 20 items, however in your presentation of findings, there are only 15 items presented. • This is a very big issue to me, I don't know where you got this 0.99 as it reliability estimate. It even exceeded the reliability estimates of standardized assessment tools which only ranges from .80 to .92. I think you need to present some additional documents/pieces of evidence how this 0.99 occur or you may discuss in your research instrument the complete details of conducting this reliability estimates. • There should also be a detailed discussion of the ethical considerations you've considered in this study. As researcher, we need to follow some ethical guidelines, especially how you've treated your respondents, and how your data being treated in terms of its confidentiality and privacy. Present also some possible risks of this type of study and who will be benefited for this type of study. • When you conduct a research study, you always need to present this portion (Theoretical framework) to present some relevant literatures about your research topic. This will let you create and have additional information about the topic, and the variables involved in your research. • More so, there should also be a presentation of your conceptual paradigm which help your reader to at least foresee the complete picture of your research study. This should be presented based on your research topic, and selected variables. • I haven't seen what the content of you assessment tools is really, however I believe that what you are presenting from your tables tells me the content. Technically, some of your items do not match with how you present the other indicators. Say it for example, your item 6 is in third person, however if you refer to the other items, they are presented in the 1st person. Since you've consider all your samples to answer this Likert scale, then your indicators should all be in the first person format. • Make some revisions in your discussion of findings, there should be an in debt and comprehensive presentation and interpretation of your findings. It is good that you've cited several literatures to support your claims.	
Minor REVISION comments	• The researcher's first sentence in the introduction was also his/her first statement of conclusion. I am suggesting to revise the first conclusion in the basis of the	

	findings of study. • Revise your introductory discussion on the statement of the problem. It would be better if you state it like “This research sought to answer the following questions:” • Change Linkert to Likert. • In the data analysis, you need only to present the specific statistical tools you’ve used to analyzed and interpret your data gathered. • Please consider this format in presenting your norms: Ranges — Descriptive Rating (DR) 3.21-4.00 — Strongly Agree 2.41-3.20 — Agree 1.61-2.40 — Disagree 0.81-1.60 — Strongly Disagree 0.00-0.80 — Undecided This should be presented in your research instrument. • The researcher may disregard (N) column in his/her tables since it was already presented in his/her sample of study (methodology). • The researcher need to describe also the Grand means which are presented on his/her tables. • Based on the presentation of the table, the researcher have shown values of standard deviations (Column 5). I think there’s a need to discuss also these values and tell some possible implications. • Please make necessary revision of the table titles. Make sure that there are presented heterogeneously. (Table 2 and 3). • You need to conclude based on your findings, you have raised three problems in your research, and there should also be three derived conclusions to be presented.	
Optional/General comments	• I haven’t seen your qualitative data in your study, based on your findings, you have presented only quantitative data which were taken thru your Likert scale. I would like to suggest to improve your discussion on your methodology of which you need to point out and discuss only the things you’ve done and you’ve used during your data gathering procedure. • When you present major parts of your manuscript, always present some introductory discussions about that particular portion. Don’t go immediately presenting the problems and their corresponding data. • I believe that this problem should have additional details of which the researcher need to find out the level of study habits of students, then correlate it with this result.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	**Mark Angelo C. Reotutar**
Department, University & Country	**University of Northern Philippines, Philippines**