

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_103418
Title of the Manuscript:	Korean Dramas and Construction of Career Woman Symbols
Type of the 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>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>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Awkward language obstructs comprehensibility</p> <p>4. No. The Methodology section is very brief and important information is missing (e.g. full explanation of the methodological framework used, how participants were recruited, ethical considerations). The analysis Section is mostly descriptive and the Conclusion section too short. Finally, in the Introduction the need for the study is not clearly stated neither in the last sentence of the penultimate paragraph on p.3 or the last sentence of the Introduction.</p> <p>5. It would be if the authors address the points above. Only then this very interesting study would be academically robust.</p> <p>6. The in-text referencing is not consistent and the others use a lot of secondary references (especially the ones found on Habib 2018)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article needs proofreading as there are instances of unclear/awkward language that impedes communication (e.g. the last sentence on p.2 "Now, with the increasingly advanced times...."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is a very interesting piece of research but it not fully researched. The themes identified are interesting but the analysis and argumentation and general methodological framework not discussed/presented in a robust way.</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:	Argyro Kantara
Department, University & Country	UWTSD, UK