Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

Point 1: One major issue of this paper is "Methods". The information provided in this section is not sufficient, and it requires further information about the context, location, participants, data collection, data analysis of this research. I suggest authors should consider this pattern in describing their methods. As the target journal for publication is an international journal with international audience, the context and location of the study will add more value, and help the readers to better understand the research.

And for participants, a table with all necessary information about all participants is required.

Data collection part is missing in the paper. Data collection is very important part of 'Methods", as it clearly describes the steps that researchers/authors took to collect the data, and whether these steps ensured the reliability and validity of the research.

Data analysis is provided, but I suggest hypothesis development should be stated separately, as hypothesis of any research is developed very earlier stage than the data analysis stage. I suggest adding one or two headings "theoretical foundation" and "Hypothesis Development" will help the readers to understand it better.

Response 1: First of all, thank you very much for your comments. Detailed information about participants was added in the 'participants' section. We added data collection section as well and described data collection process in detail. We also stated hypotheses based on the purpose of study at the end of introduction section.

Point 2: Another major issue is the structure and information provided. As I stated earlier in previous comment, hypothesis should be described separately. And the section "Measures" does not include any specific information regarding the questionnaire. Whether authors developed these measures by themselves, or they adopted it from other sources and revised it before using? . In the first case, if developed by authors, how did they check the validity and reliability of the contents? In the second case, if adopted from other sources, a detailed description is requires on "what contents were adopted from which source", how did the authors revised these contents, and how did the reliability and validity of the constructs was checked?

And a questionnaire used for this paper should be attached in appendix. It will help the research to attract more readers, and also more opportunity to get cited after publication.

Response 2: We added more information regarding the survey questionnaire development, reliability, and validity. Also we put the survey questionnaire as appendix at the end of the manuscript.

Point 3: The discussion section does not discuss the findings of the research in depth. The discussion should be focused on the findings of this paper, and argue these findings with the previous studies.

The discussion section require massive revision. I suggest authors to read the following guidelines by the San José State University Writing Center for writing discussion in research paper. https://www.sjsu.edu/writingcenter/docs/handouts/Discussion%20Section%20for%20Research%20Papers.pdf

Response 3: The discussion part were updated by reflecting guidelines of the San José State University Writing Center, including the findings of this paper and arguing the findings with previous studies.

Point 4: Some minor issues that needs consideration. 1- The conclusion part should be written separately, and this section further require to report the limitation of the research, and implications of the research, and suggestions for future studies. 2- The source of table 1 is missing, as it provides secondary information. 3- Despite of the fact that digital books/technologies improves students learnings, but recent research also reports the negative effects of these technologies on students. Thus, the negative effects of digital technologies should also be discussed, in the background section, and in the conclusion section.

Response 4:

1. The conclusion part was written separately and the section further reported the limitations of the research, implications of the research, and suggestions for the future studies.
2. The source of Table 1 was presented.
3. The negative effects of digital technologies were discussed in the background section, and in the conclusion section.