

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_45323
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS MILITATING AGAINST THE INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES FOR E VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 agree highlight that part in the man his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	This is a conceptual paper. Therefore, it is expected that the author to demonstrate a vast and comprehensive reading regarding the title or area of interest of this paper. However, in most of the paragraphs, there are insufficiency of references or citation made. Many sweeping statements can be found in many paragraphs. These flaws have impacted the credibility of the writing itself.	
	Usually in any conceptual paper, there must also an explanation on the methodology used in searching for related articles. For example, what database used to derive to articles, how were then the number of articles further filtered? What are the keywords used etc. Then the author also needs to explain how was the analysis of the articles done. For example, using a thematic analysis?	
	The motivation behind the writing of the article also needs to be clearly presented. Why is it vital to look at the factors hindering to the use of technology among TVET teachers? How can the factors be different other discipline, for example, science and mathematics teachers?	
	It is also crucial for the author to then explicitly write proposed measures to lessen the problems perhaps – and this needs to be related to the context of the study (Africa I believe).	
	The overall idea is there, but the author may need to read up more conceptual papers from other journals to familiarize himself with the nature of conceptual paper writing.	
	I wish you best of luck.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

EFFECTIVENESS OF TECHNICAL AND

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed wi that part in the manuscript. It is m feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fariza Khalid
Department, University & Country	Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight s mandatory that authors should write his/her