



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18434
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption of eLearning Technology in Nigerian Tertiary Institution of Learning
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

	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	1. Bring reference for 92-100 2. E-learning Moodle in Nigeria University: is too long. Please make it short. One paragraph is enough 3. 157-162 doesn't need 4. One time explain the advantages of e-learning system then mentioned the instrument if this study is as same. There are many repetitions. 5. Mobile technology from 190-210, please make short as the CMS. 6. 262-272 as a research finding is too long and repeated, male it short. 7. 281-286 explain the model that does not used in this research, so it doesn't need. 8. 344 it is not clear it is two or more universities. Please rewrite. 9. 326 mentioned 4 moderator variables but in 360 mentioned another moderator, moreover in the model, the moderator are others. Find out moderator variables exactly. 10. From 380 to 384, the questionnaire was obtained from what reference? The reference from every questionnaire used in the study must be written. 11. Removed the table 405 12. Please replace 471-474 to 481 after AVE results. 13. There is essential reference for 491-494. 14. Table2 (416) there should be the items of the questionnaire or the items refer to appendix. The readers don't know the items number refer to what	Corrected Paragraph reduced deleted repetitions removed shortened I have remove this Re-written It is a continuing statement from last sentence Referenced Table 1 explain the characteristics of the data. It must the included 12. Averaged



SDI Review Form 1.6

	questions. 15. 420-425 is better to compare the overall mean and SD for each construct. 16. Table 6 (500) need subscript for every variables. 17. Table 6 (500) is not good format. Please change the format. 18. Fit index and RAMSEA must be report as a one model fit for the whole model (not three models). SEM used to analysis a model simultaneously with different variables in one model and we report the CFA index and RAMSEA one time only. It is not correct that CFA index and RAMSEA reported one by one. 19. There is a not criterion as 70% (512). You should compare the effect size among variables. 20. When you used SEM there is nit need the regression analysis. Remove table 10. 21. 608-612 must be replaced after 480 when you reported abut items not construct. 22. Hypothesis 6 is not the result (361). 23. The steps of the analysis data and the reports are not correct. 24. Concussion is not conclusion actually. in conclusion repeated the analysis output. Pleas rewrite conclusion by comparing the other studies in this area and who are scaffold of this study, what is the advantage and contribution of this study.	Listed Considered done Done I can get another better format. I have search lieratures I have four different model I accordance with the author of UTAUT (Venkatesh et al.2003) Removed Removed Corrected Represented.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		