

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_104120
Title of the Manuscript:	Game behavior of negative public opinion in colleges and universities and its rectification and optimization
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:

(<https://journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community because it aims to improve the students behaviors with their colleges, in addition the research depends on very important theory which were excellent choice.</p> <p>The title is completely suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, the researcher depends on scientific method in his study.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct, the researcher uses scientific method and write the literature review.</p> <p>The references are recent but not sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In general, the manuscript is important, comprehensive and wrote in scientifically, but the researcher has to promote with some references.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eman Metwally Mohamed Arafat
Department, University & Country	Modern University for Technology and Information, Egypt