

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>Yes. It is important for the scientific community. The authors have tried to focus on public opinion in colleges and universities, which attracts widespread attention from the public. Additionally, they mentioned that building trust and addressing students' demands is equally important due to the rapid development of information technology</p> <p>Yes. The title of the article seems to be good.</p> <p>Yes. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes. The approach and methodology seem to be Ok. But, as no real data is used for building the model, it's difficult to say that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>No, references are not sufficient, and latest references needs to be added. It has been observed that 3-4 references in this article are almost 8-10 years old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Data collection needs to be done, for getting improved results. Model needs to be developed using real data i.e. opinion of all the stakeholders needs to be incorporated. Results needs to be displayed in tabular form or in charts, display etc mentioning that optimization has been done.	

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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. S. Thakur
Department, University & Country	MCKV Institute of Engineering, India