



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_61705
Title of the Manuscript:	Availability of Instructional Materials on Students' Academic Performance in Senior Secondary Schools in Maiduguri Metropolis, Borno state
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	In general, it is identified that in its structure and content the manuscript is presented consistently. The contextualization of the problem situation as well as the consistency between goals, justification and social relevance are well defined in the manuscript. The methodology of the work is coherent and adequate with what was intended in the study and is in due detail of the steps that were used during the study. The results are accurately described and in accordance with what was collected and reported in the methodology. Finally, the discussion is consistent with the data and dialogues with the proposed objectives and the results obtained.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are issues that are not clear in the research design for the reader who does not know the educational system of the place in question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The authors do not make it clear which criteria were used to classify instructional materials as adequate or inadequate. b) Need to clarify classification criteria for experimental groups: students taught using instructional material (EG) and those taught without the use of instructional material (CG). c) The authors indicate that the performance data were collected through the Pro forma, however it is necessary to describe in more detail the process of selection, organization, and categorization of this data. d) The table 2: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient on the Relationship between Availability of Instructional materials and Students' Academic Performance in Senior Secondary Schools in Maiduguri metropolis with the data and the co-relations between them need more information and discussions. 	
Optional/General comments	For a reader who does not know the educational system analysed, some explanation of the system's curriculum structure, the issue of large-scale assessment and instructional materials is needed.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edson José Wartha
Department, University & Country	University Federal of Sergipe, Brazil