

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_86930
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining Career Prospects of Mobile Journalism amongst Journalism Students
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> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>General comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is recommend to present a paper with article structure in the style of "IMRADC", that is 1. Introduction; 2. The Proposed Method/Algorithm/Procedure specifically designed (optional); 3. Method; 4. Results and Discussions; 5. Conclusions.</li> <li>2) Part of Introduction: explain the context of the study and state the precise objective. An Introduction have to contain the following parts:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Background: Authors have to make clear what the context is. Ideally, authors should give an idea of the SoTA (State-of-The Art) of the field the report is about.</li> <li>b. The Problem: If there was no problem, there would be no reason for writing a manuscript, and definitely no reason for reading it. So, please tell readers why they should proceed reading. Experience shows that for this part a few lines are often sufficient.</li> <li>c. The Proposed Solution: Now and only now! - authors may outline the contribution of the manuscript. Here authors have to make sure readers point out what are the novel aspects of authors work. Authors should place the paper in proper context by citing relevant papers. At least, 15 references are referred in this section. Reference year should be less than 5 years from now.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3) Part of Method: the presentation of the experimental methods should be clear and complete in every detail facilitating reproducibility by other scientists.</li> <li>4) Part of Results and discussion: The presentation of results should be simple and straightforward in style. This section report the most important findings, including results of statistical analyses as appropriate and comparisons to other research results. Results given in figures should not be repeated in tables. This is where the author(s) should explain in words what he/she/they discovered in the research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. This section should be supported suitable references.</li> <li>5) About Figures &amp; Tables in your manuscript:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Because tables and figures supplement the text, all tables and figures should be referenced in the text. Authors must explain what the reader should look for when using the table or figure. Focus only on the important point the reader should draw from them, and leave the details for the reader to examine on her own.</li> <li>b. Tables are to be presented with single horizontal line under: the table caption, the column headings and at the end of the table. All tables are produced by creating tables in MS Word. Captured tables are NOT allowed.</li> <li>c. All figures must in high quality images. Use different patterns for presenting different results in your figures/graphics (instead of different colors). It is mandatory!!</li> </ol> </li> <li>6) Part of Conclusion: Summarize sentences the primary outcomes of the study in a paragraph. Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?</li> <li>7) Most importantly, please ensure the similarity score is less than 25%.</li> </ol> <p>Please ensure that all references have been cited in your text. Use a tool such as EndNote, Mendeley, or Zotero for reference management and formatting, and choose IEEE style. Each citation should be written in the order of appearance in the text in square brackets.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The writing system is recommended to follow the IMRADC writing structure</li> <li>2) In my opinion, community structure and family background also influence a person's career choice. For this reason, these factors also need to be discussed in the introduction</li> <li>3) Interviews were conducted only "snapshot". Whether the momentary ("snapshot") condition can reflect a person's complete condition in attitude. This needs to be explained because it is the main part of the research method. This will affect the conclusions of the research results.</li> <li>4) So that the results can be replicated by other researchers, any variables and interview techniques need to be elaborated in the research method.</li> <li>5) How can the reasons or justifications for a sample of only 10 respondents be considered sufficiently representative of the population of this study?</li> <li>6) Conclusions should be written briefly and directly answer the problem formulation or research objectives. It's better if the conclusion is rewritten more straight-forward</li> <li>7) I recommend that the references taken is the one whose publication is less than 5 years from now.</li> </ol>	

## Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The findings of this research are quite interesting, however, this paper should be rewritten with the IMRAD writing structure. In addition, the methodological explanation needs to be elaborated in more detail, to make it easier for readers to understand it. Comparing the analysis with cases in other countries might help the sharpness of the results of this research.	
----------------------------------	--	--

### **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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Dimiyati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Indonesia, Indonesia</b>