

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_104323
Title of the Manuscript:	Econometrics Modelling Approach to Examine the Relationship Between STEM Policy Changes and Asian Student's Enrollment Decision in USA
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://www.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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is beneficial to its readers as it provides a new angle on the impact of the STEM extension policy change on Asian students' decisions to enroll in a STEM major program. This paper shows great value to the community. 2. Title is perfect. No changes on the title as it addresses the key elements of this research. 3. The abstract is overall good. The written abstract contains the key elements, background of the study, research objectives, methodology and findings. Although it is also suggested to add importance or significance of this research at the end of the abstract. 4. This article has been written well and all subsections of the chapters and sub-chapters have been organized accordingly. The presentation of the article is good. 5. The data analysis is impressive. The difference-in-difference (DID) econometrics quantitative method was utilized to examine the impact of the STEM extension policy. Overall, the results of the variables estimated in the analysis shows a comprehensive study. 6. The number of references is good and up to date. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The written English language is good. The article is written very clearly.	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	This article should be considered for publication as it is written well. The data analyzed and presented in the article has summarized the objective of the study accordingly.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vijayaletchumy Subramaniam
Department, University & Country	Malaysia