

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_84452
Title of the Manuscript:	Student's Awareness of Free and Open-Source Software (FOSS) in Higher Education
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> <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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>This paper is about students' perceptions of free open source software in higher education. The data is composed of student questionnaires, but it is thought that the presence or absence of previous experience and the content of basic education, which is fundamentally different from country to country, will have an effect, but these are rarely mentioned. Also, there is almost no description of what kind of software it is. It is thought that these obscure the gist of the dissertation. The judges are in a different country from the author, and it seems that there are some parts that cannot be understood due to differences in social systems. If you wish to continue submitting in this journal, I think it would be easier to understand if you clarified such domestic circumstances. Also, the student's consciousness is different from the objective acquisition of skills. If you want to match the purpose of this journal, I think that you need a separate means (data) to measure the educational results you have acquired.</p> <p>The following is a list of unclear points. Please refer.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>General remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Isn't FOSS selected and used arbitrarily due to the savings in software costs and personal needs? Is it difficult to use if it is not guided by an experienced user or installed on a shared PC first? It is not understood by people from other countries. In other countries, the software is often downloaded by individuals based on usage reviews and used at their own risk. However, being free of charge is often thought to mean that there is a risk of bugs and viruses lurking. Basically, the program is not modified.</li><li>- If it is not general free software, it will be easier to understand if you add specific examples (there are many free software that can be used for hobbies, games, learning assistance, etc.).</li><li>- As a background, it may be good to show the percentage of people who go to university and IOT education up to the university.</li></ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>Details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- In ABSTRACT, if you use the abbreviation FOSS at the beginning, you can write only the abbreviation after that.</li><li>- It is written at the beginning that it is intended for graduate students, but in the latter half it is a university student. It is better to unify. If you are a graduate student, you will probably have certain skills by the time you reach university (in countries with judges, etc.), which will change the way you understand the content of your dissertation.</li><li>- The keywords FOSS and Awareness are inappropriate as keywords because they are special abbreviations used this time and terms that have a broad meaning in general, respectively.</li><li>- What is the first line on P7? (Part of the result? It is better to unify the writing style of the text)</li></ul>	

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:	Jun Kobayashi
Department, University & Country	University of Kochi, Japan