

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_86821
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE ROLE OF BROADCAST JOURNALISM IN RESHAPING THE POLITICAL TERRAIN IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Paper is good, covers all steps of research process. Abstract is the summary of the research work. The main parameters of the abstract are: what, how, and why. What: It includes definition of the research work means what is going on in research work. How: It covers methodology part means define a technique/ methodology that help to execute your research work. Why: It focus application of the research work means where it can use. Overall, references are not cited properly, it should be better.	
Minor REVISION comments	Results and discussion must be included in tabular form	
Optional/General comments	Methodology is a process or set of rules to be followed in calculations or other problem-solving operations. It should be written in proper way with comments that help to understand. Overall, it may include step by step in this paper. A conclusion is the last part of something, its end or result. When you write a paper, you always end by summing up your arguments and drawing a conclusion about what you've been writing about. Overall, your paper may conclude better way.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shaik Abdul Mazeed
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India