



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_29633
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Electronic Information Resources by Undergraduate Students in the Faculty of Management and Administration at Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Please proofread for grammar, punctuation, citation style, spelling, and repetitiveness (e.g., lines 68 and 74)</p> <p>Normally, you have a shorter introduction stating need and intent. Then you have your literature review (which seems to be part of your introduction).</p> <p>Tighten the abstract I it is too detailed and repetitive)</p> <p>Last part of 3.1 is not necessary. But you SHOULD note the use of observations.</p> <p>Did you pilot-test or validate your survey instrument? Why did you not use a pre-existing validated instrument?</p> <p>In 3.2 you need to specify the college of the population (which you mentioned in the abstract)</p> <p>Pie chart (figure 1) is wrong type of chart (doesn't add up to 100%). You should use a bar chart/histogram.</p> <p>I am puzzled: the population had just had information literacy instruction – did it not include the use of DBs? Did the teachers not attend or know the content to be addressed? You should state the content/curriculum of the info lit training. It would have been useful for the researchers to have observed the info lit training.</p> <p>Clarify terms in figure 2: isn't a group project or research paper a course assignment? Might the respondents been unclear in their answers?</p> <p>Conclusion: I would disagree, since 90% said they</p>	<p>Last part of 3.1 removed. Line 73-74 removed.</p> <p>Fig. 2 revised</p> <p>Abstract revised and edited</p> <p>All revised sections of the paper highlighted in yellow color</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	had sufficient training. The problem seems to be more of a professor/clarify of assignment problem. And 70% mentioned poor Internet connectivity – that should be in the conclusion. (Note discrepancy between table 3 and figure 4 in terms of skills; - resolve that....)	
Minor REVISION comments	If using direct quotations, include the quotation marks (e.g., line 34-35) – or is the citation designation incorrect with the colon?? Cite source for Princeton study (line 123) It's not surprising that undergrads use DBs less (line 124); they probably didn't have access to DBs before they started college.	Last statement on the description of Fig. 4 removed.
Optional/General comments	I agree with the recommendations.	