

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_125534
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF OBJECTIVITY LEVELS OF NEWS REPORTAGE VIA SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors</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.	Objectivity in news has been discussed for years. Social media has existed in the 21st Century. There is a need for scientific studies on the objectivity of the news published in this medium. The study is important in this respect.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is "Assessment of Objectivity Levels of News Reportage Via Social Media Platforms". It can stay like this. But, it would be better if the title was changed to "Assessment of Objectivity Levels of News an Social Media Platforms".	
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.	The abstract of the article is appropriate and sufficient. However, it would be appropriate to specify how the sample was obtained.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	This article meets the content and form requirements required for a scientific study.	
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.	This article consists of introduction, statement of problem, research question, theoretical framework, conceptual framework sections. Under the title of conceptual framework, there are the concept of social media or social networking, the concept of objectivity, objectivity level in news reportage on social media. Moreover, there are methodology and data presentation. There is data analysis under the title of data presentation. Then there is discussion, conclusion and recommendations. Under the title of data analysis, it is not explained how the sample was determined. How the sample was determined should be explained by the author. The opinions of those who use social media a lot and those who use it less, about the news on social media should be given separately. Again, it would be appropriate to present the opinions regarding the news in a table according to the age, gender and education levels of the participants.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It would be appropriate if the author adds new references. References after 2015 are especially important. Because people using social media are increasing every year. Scientific studies on the subject have also increased in recent years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	This article may be published with minor revision. 1. How the sample was determined should be explained by the author. 2. The opinions of those who use social media a lot and those who use it less, about the news on social media should be given separately. 3. Again, it would be appropriate to present the opinions regarding the news in a table according to the age, gender and education levels of the participants. These corrections need to be made. This article may be published with minor revision. However, the deficiencies mentioned above need to be completed.	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nurettin GÜZ
Department, University & Country	Istanbul Ticaret University, Türkiye