Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJESS_84239**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Modelling the Effects of Variety-Seeking on WOM in a Livestream Context**
Type of the 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

	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	**Overall, the manuscript has some values and information to the body of knowledge and policy makers. I reviewed it with high interest , yet , before proceeding to the next step/exposition/publishing , the paper needs rework/revisions as per my comments and improvement suggestions. I hope the editor would be able to verify these and that of other reviewers before considering the paper for next steps.** Abstract needs to be very clear with objective, conclusion derived from the findings. The manuscript content, including introduction[who is the information sender…], review of relevant literature, results needs refinement (technically and presentation/edits). Revise the whole MS as it is suffering from language problems with unnecessary articles, punctuations….e.g. don't delve into confusing wordings [e.g. the results of the study finding…..] What is the source of the research framework/the figure you roughly included? Variable definition is attached to literature/previous studies than operationalized from the context of this study, convince me with the justification/rationale for delving into relying on the already validated/tested variables? What is the relevance to the context of this study? Addressing these comments also affects the study design, sampling, results, conclusion…so make the necessary adjustments I would recommend original language editor should be consulted for review as well as statistician. Unit of analysis and data source lacking… pls include these while reviewing	
Minor REVISION comments	Refine the whole manuscript before recommending acceptance	
Optional/General comments	Rewrite the abstract Language edition	

Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Philipos Petros Gile**
Department, University & Country	**Ethiopia**