

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_119564
Title of the Manuscript:	Smart Media or Biased Media: The Impacts and Challenges of AI and Big Data on the Media Industry
Type of the Article	Survey paper

### 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. It explores how AI and big data influence content personalization, creation, and marketing, and their effects on cultural diversity and societal norms. The findings provide valuable insights for future research, policy-making, and industry practices in the media sector.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable but can still be improve such as: "AI and Big Data in Media Industry: Ethical Implications and Societal Impact"</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and captured clearly the content of the paper.</p> <p>4. The subsection need improvement but the organisation of the paper is good.</p> <p>5. Absolutely correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but few can be added to improve the margin of the research area.</p> <p>7. Need to improve on the citations, follow the appropriate standard.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the language used in the article is good.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The quality of the paper is good but can still be improve.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ayuba John
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutse, Nigeria