

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_122145</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Headlines to Hard-Lines: Media Intervention in Managing Bullying and Cancel Culture in the Entertainment Industry</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides thorough methodology and robust data analysis that leads to valuable insights that may lead to new avenues for research and practical applications. Personally, I find this manuscript compelling due to its innovative approach and the potential implications for real-world application. However, it would benefit from further exploration of suggested amendments, which could enhance its impact and applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	While the abstract mentions that the research reveals a predominantly negative sentiment, it does not provide specific details or examples of the findings. Including a brief summary of key findings would provide more insight into the study's results. The recommendations, though innovative, are somewhat vague. More specifics on how these recommendations could be implemented, monitored, and evaluated would make the suggestions more actionable and practical. The abstract touches on various aspects, such as psychological impact, media influence, and economic disparities, which might lead to perceived overlap. A more focused summary on key insights could improve clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors have employed well-established methodologies and provided a detailed account of their procedures, which enhances the reproducibility of their results. Additionally, the data analyses are appropriately conducted, and the conclusions are well-supported by the data presented. The manuscript also addresses potential sources of error and includes thorough discussions of the results, demonstrating a high level of technical soundness and scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes, However, it will be better to enhance the scope of reference till past 10 years.	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b> While the abstract mentions that the research reveals a predominantly negative sentiment, it does not provide specific details or examples of the findings. Including a brief summary of key findings would provide more insight into the study's results. The recommendations, though innovative, are somewhat vague. More specifics on how these recommendations could be implemented, monitored, and evaluated would make the suggestions more actionable and practical. The abstract touches on various aspects, such as psychological impact, media influence, and economic disparities, which might lead to perceived overlap. A more focused summary on key insights could improve clarity.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The introduction does not clearly articulate a problem statement or central research question. Providing a more explicit research aim would help guide the reader and clarify the focus of the study. The introduction briefly mentions the intention to propose strategies for mitigating bullying and cancel culture but does not elaborate on these strategies. Providing an overview of potential solutions could add more depth to the introduction.</p> <p><b>Literature Review:</b> The transitions between sections could be smoother. The review jumps from one topic to another without clear connections, which can make it challenging to follow the overall narrative. While the review is thorough, it primarily presents the negative aspects of bullying, cancel culture, and social media without exploring potential counterarguments or alternative perspectives. Addressing counterarguments could provide a more balanced view. While the review covers a wide range of topics, it could benefit from a stronger synthesis of the information. Summarizing key findings and linking them to the overarching research question would help tie the sections together more effectively.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> The explanation of how thematic and sentiment analyses were integrated through triangulation could be more detailed. It's important to clarify how discrepancies between qualitative and quantitative results were addressed and how they inform the overall findings. The formula for calculating sentiment scores is presented without much context. Adding a brief explanation of the significance of the formula and how it contributes to the analysis would help readers understand its relevance.</p> <p><b>Findings and Discussions:</b> The results and discussion sections do not address any limitations of the study, such as potential biases in the selected articles or sentiment analysis tools. Including a section on limitations would provide a more balanced view of the research. The analysis mentions peaks and trends in publications but does not deeply explore possible reasons behind these trends or their implications. More analysis on why certain years saw increased interest could offer valuable insights.</p> <p><b>Conclusion and Recommendation:</b> While the recommendations are practical, they lack detailed implementation plans or strategies. For instance, how the digital literacy campaign would be rolled out or the specific functions of the proposed regulatory body are not detailed, which could leave stakeholders unclear on how to proceed. The recommendations could benefit from acknowledging and building on existing initiatives or frameworks that address similar issues. This would provide a more integrated approach and avoid reinventing the wheel. The focus on creating regulatory bodies and certifications might be perceived as heavy-handed by some stakeholders. It could be useful to balance these measures with more collaborative or community-based approaches. The suggestion for future studies is valuable but could be more specific about the methodologies or approaches needed. For instance, it could detail which participant observatory methods might be most effective or how they would address the research gaps identified.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**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:	<b>Ranna Bhatt</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>IIM, India</b>