

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95538
Title of the Manuscript:	BEYOND THE HASHTAGS: CONSTRUCTS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE STUDENTS ON SOCIAL MEDIA AS A FORM OF JUSTICE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Nowadays, when the Internet seems to control all aspects of our lives, the topic discussed in this article is topical. Given the fact that Political Science, as a subgroup of social sciences, analyzes political activities, theories and behaviors, we can consider that the debated topic is and can become important for the scientific community of this field. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Yes, it is appropriate. The content of the article is related to the title chosen by the author(s). 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, it is satisfying and comprehensive. Here it is shown where the author(s) starts in the elaboration of the study, the methods used, the conclusion reached. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Yes, the bibliographic titles used are sufficient and very recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments	The Conclusion chapter is missing. It is true that the author(s) intitled their final major chapter RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. This does not imply any Conclusions, but only discussions about the procedure and methods used. It is important to have a chapter that summarizes what was previously discussed in the paper.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Popoviciu Gabriela-Argentina
Department, University & Country	University of Oradea, Romania