

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95900
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Social Media for Political Communication among University Students in Bangladesh
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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 provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The study has scientific merit. The title is good. The abstract is good. The "Purpose of the study" section is rough and tries to encompass too many concepts. It appears to be a post-hoc description, providing rationale for the findings, rather than a statement of solid scientific inquiry for why the study was undertaken in the first place. "The study was undertaken to determine....." rather than "We found...." <p>RQ2: <i>Is SM use a factor in the forming of political opinion?</i> would be a better wording. It is possible students with an opinion seek out SM activities rather than SM use creating the opinion. Also, this question is NOT one of the hypothesis apparently being tested. Mismatch in the manuscript between what they wanted to know and what they tested.</p> <p>Gender pg 5: Sentence: "Understanding how female politicians engage in a male-dominated political context has been a key focus of this study." Not really the focus of this study- How they communicate is not the same as how female students use SM for political activities. This entire subsection is awkward and does not tie-into the study of student use. Rather, how do students perceive gendered candidates and does the communication style impact their engagement on SM would be the better inquiry and this section should support that inquiry.</p> <p>The two Hypotheses are not a natural conclusion from the lit review. WHY would final year students be more engaged? Nothing in the lit review refers to age or advanced education for engagement. Also, WHY would male students be more engaged? Female politicians may communicate differently but it does not then naturally follow that female students are less engaged?? Some of this is in the results section but should be here to support the analyses. The Theoretical framework section has no real connection to the lit review or the hypotheses and is not adequately incorporated into the manuscript but rather is just "stuck in" with no connection. Better integration is needed.</p> <p>Also, manuscript is missing appendices that include the actual survey questions and the sources of those questions (previous validated surveys, created for this study, etc.) . Unable to determine how/what participants were asked and how they were answering. "The mean of engagement..." does not adequately inform the reader of what counts as engagement? What was the scale? How many questions? Etc.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The concept is great and there are passages that flow BUT a lot of extraneous information that is not scientifically connected needs to be edited out/trimmed/better integrated Current Facebook use (2022) is 2.96 Billion=paper cites 2015 @ 800million 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Authors often state "this study" but it is not clear if they mean the current study OR the one they are citing? Is confusing as often the "this study" is beyond the scope of the current study but grammatically the reader assumes it is the current study. "...know which political topic students found more thoughtful in social media." What is meant by "thoughtful"? The students thought about it more? The person posting gave it more thought? I had some deeper meaning? This is unclear Fig 2 lacks clarity. Why is there a bar for "total" and what is the orange line indicating? Why is the total of 800 only representing 90% on the graph? P-values are either p<.05; p<.01; or p<.001. Don't take it out 8 decimal places! "We proved through our second hypothesis testing that..." A single study NEVER proves! It demonstrates, indicates, highlights, etc. Don't continue to report findings in the conclusion. ALL findings should be in the results/discussion sections. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Contribution sections and lit review are good and offer scientifically sound information. The other sections of the paper do not flow from or into these sections.</p>	

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:	Carrie L Carmody
Department, University & Country	California State University, USA