

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_113522
Title of the Manuscript:	Social media, sexualization mania and cultural shifts
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> <p>Direct language must be used for writing any research work without going round an issue.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The title is not suitable because it is not problematized with a definite locale. It is like a title of a book. It can be: Investigating the impact of social media, sexualisation mania and cultural shifts in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive. It describes only the problem but it does not indicate the methodology applied, the findings and the recommendations. An abstract is a standalone summary of a research work and therefore can be read without reading the whole document.</p> <p>The subsections and the structure are not appropriate. The introduction does not introduce the reader to what the article discusses. Instead of giving a series of notes in sections, everything can be discussed under "Review of related literature" and then analysis and discussion provided.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct since it provides notes.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English is good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article can be improved.</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:	Atieno Kili K'Odhiambo
Department, University & Country	University of Nairobi, Kenya