



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_53793
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender and Faculty of Study as Predictors of Undergraduate Students' Academic Achievement in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>After reading the paper I feel that the manuscript is of potential interest to the readership of this journal, but there are major issues that must be addressed before the article could be published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/* The literature review should be more carefully synthesised and structured.</li> <li>/* There does not appear to be an explicit theoretical framework - this makes it difficult to explain the differences between outcomes of the research groups. Currently the manuscript appears to be somewhat descriptive and a theoretical.</li> <li>/* The results section requires far greater organisation and structuring. The analysis is too general, and the reported results are somewhat selective. This section needs to be more carefully and systematically constructed.</li> <li>/* Further, the analysis and findings must be critical and interpretive rather than just descriptive.</li> <li>/* The final discussion and conclusion should make it clear how the findings contribute to new knowledge.</li> <li>/* The Methodology lacked suitable detail.</li> <li>/* Methodology of the central work is exposed appropriately.</li> <li>/* Research methodology based on research goals is poor on absent.</li> <li>/* The research/evaluation methodology is not justified, clear and appropriate (including ethical considerations / approval where appropriate)</li> <li>/* More recent bibliography is necessary. Furthermore, the reference list is a little bit weak. Before I can make a final decision on the paper, please refer to more references and upload a new version. It is suggested that the author(s) can consider the following papers related to gender differences in education to strengthen the background and conclusions of the study:</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Papadakis, S., Tousia, C. &amp; Polychronaki, K. (2018). Women in computer science. The case study of the Computer Science Department of the University of Crete, Greece. <i>Int. J. Teaching and Case Studies</i>, 9, 2, 142–151.</li> <li>• Papadakis, S. (2018). Gender stereotypes in Greek computer science school textbooks. <i>International Journal of Teaching and Case Studies</i>, 9(1), 48-71.</li> <li>• Papadakis, S. (2018). Evaluating pre-service teachers' acceptance of mobile devices with regards to their age and gender: a case study in Greece. <i>International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation</i>, 12(4), 336-352.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>/* The academic writing needs work.</li> <li>/* The discussion should be more concise and the outcomes should be discussed in relation to the existing research. The language style of this section has to improve.</li> <li>/* Recommendations should also be given for practice and further research.</li> <li>/* Some references within the paper body are not correct.</li> <li>/* The paper must be correctly formatted according the journal format</li> <li>/* Similarity check with iThenticate revealed a similarity index of 10% which is considered appropriate.</li> <li>/* In preparing a revised manuscript, please also include a table of how you have responded to each of the issues listed above point by point.</li> </ul> <p>I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript in the near future.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Stamatis Papadakis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Crete, Greece</b>