



Paper: “Gender Inequality on the Uses of the Internet: A Study of Dhaka City of Bangladesh”

Corresponding Author: Jahangir Alam

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p151

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Babatunde Ezekiel Olusegun
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Honore Kahi
University of Bouake, Cote d’Ivoire

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: KAHI	
University/Country: Bouaké / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: august, 09 th , 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: august, 10 th , 2020
Manuscript Title: Gender Inequality on the Uses of the Internet: A Study of Dhaka City of Bangladesh	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 46.08.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Reduce the length of the text (follow the remarks proposed in the text)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>See observation after first paragraph of "Findings and Recommendations"</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be better to enrich with the contributions of the following three theories your text in one paragraph. :

- critical mass of equipment theory :

Uhlig RP., Farber DJ. Bair JH (1979), The office of the Future, Volume 1 : *Communication and computer*, s.e., North-Holland, Monograph series of international council for computer communications.

<https://www.amazon.com/Office-Future-Communication-Computers/dp/1483249670>

<https://revues.imist.ma/index.php/ISMI/article/view/7133>

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316968879_Choice_use_and_appropriation_of_email_an_ever_evolutionary_technology

- social presence theory :

Short JA, Williams E., Christie B. (1976), *The Social Psychology of Telecommunications*, John Wiley and sons, News York.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265375995_Social_Presence

http://www.sonja-utz.de/SIPMUDs_Utz.pdf

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_presence_theory

https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=isalt_resources

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/44ff/5cd22d06ef9ebe1a16cde46d50f3d97a52f9.pdf>

- media richness theory :

Trevino LK. Lengel RH., Daft RL. (1987), « Media Symbolism, Media Richness, and media Choice in Organization. A symbolic interactionist Quaterly, Vol. 11, p. 355-366

<https://pennstate.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/media-symbolism-media-richness-and-media-choice-in-organizations->

https://www.chds.us/coursefiles/IS4010/lectures/tech_media_richness_long/story_content/external_files/Media%20Richness%20Theory%20Script.pdf

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/256843?seq=1>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Media_richness_theory

Please, add the contributions of these three theories to better understand why users, women or men spend enough time on the technical devices of the web.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Very good paper

Good descriptive and analytical study

Should be enriched by the contributions of three theories, if possible

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr E. O. Babatunde	
University/Country: University of Ibadan, Ibadan. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 2 nd August, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 7 th August, 2020
Manuscript Title: Gender Inequality on the Uses of the Internet: A Study of Dhaka City of Bangladesh	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0846/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is apt and very clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The abstract is concise	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are lot of grammatical errors in the work that the author should address	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methodology was not well presented. Author should take a second look at the comments and readjust the presentation	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors should work on the result and present them with well laid tables and discussion. The work was not related to previous works and therby making it difficult to know the strength and weakness of the current paper.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is too shallow and does not show the summary of the work done in the paper. Author needs to rework, come up with the importance of the study and the recommendation.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is difficult for me to decide whether the references are appropriate or not since the style used and ESJ style is not specified. However, the references are comprehensive.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author to critically effect the corrections and follow ESJ style of referencing

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: