Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JESBS_46657**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DESIGN OF METRIC TO IDENTIFY KEY OPINION LEADERS IN RESEARCH**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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	**ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DESIGN OF METRIC TO IDENTIFY KEY OPINION LEADERS IN RESEARCH** I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The subject is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments: **-Method:** The authors should demonstrate that the variables they choose for identify key opinion leaders in research are valid (internal, external, construct validity). That is, can I trust the results of the research? Are their results true? Are the results obtained compared with other quantitative and qualitative methods? **-References:** Review, please, the rules of the Journal. The authors should review the References, since it is not clear that they are correct. For example, the authors write: [11] Rosenfield, L.B .; Richman, J.M. (1997) Developing effective social support: Team building and the social support process, Journal of Sport Psychology, 9 (1), 133-153 But it does not correspond to the one found at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413209708415388 The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals For example: Harvard business review. NLM Title Abbreviation: Harv Bus Rev **-Keywords:** For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search)	The author is appreciative of the comments of the reviewer that the subject of the manuscript is interesting. Thank you. Method: The method of the study is a RATIONAL approach , and the scope of the paper is limited to this. Demonstration of validity of the variables chosen through validity construct can be the subject of other studies by other researchers. As a guide, other interested researchers can test validity for different fields and geographic locations. This concern can also be a subject of enquiry for student research studies. This way, other interested persons can come into the research area. In the discussion of the results, author has identified that the result agrees with other works such as: Albahali & Omran, [10], Rosenfield & Richman,[11] and Widmeyer & Ducharme,[12]. References The information used for writing the references was obtained from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413209708415388 I think they do correspond. It will be fine if the review can specifically identify areas of non-correspondence
Minor REVISION comments		

Optional/General comments		

SDI 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	**ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DESIGN OF METRIC TO IDENTIFY KEY OPINION LEADERS IN RESEARCH** I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The subject is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments: **-Method:** The authors should demonstrate that the variables they choose for identify key opinion leaders in research are valid (internal, external, construct validity). That is, can I trust the results of the research? Are their results true? Are the results obtained compared with other quantitative and qualitative methods? **-References:** Review, please, the rules of the Journal. The authors should review the References, since it is not clear that they are correct. For example, the authors write: [11] Rosenfield, L.B .; Richman, J.M. (1997) Developing effective social support: Team building and the social support process, Journal of Sport Psychology, 9 (1), 133-153 But it does not correspond to the one found at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413209708415388 The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals For example: Harvard business review. NLM Title Abbreviation: Harv Bus Rev **-Keywords:** For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search)	The author is appreciative of the comments of the reviewer that the subject of the manuscript is interesting. Thank you. Method: The method of the study is a RATIONAL approach , and the scope of the paper is limited to this. Demonstration of validity of the variables chosen through validity construct can be the subject of other studies by other researchers. As a guide, other interested researchers can test validity for different fields and geographic locations. This concern can also be a subject of enquiry for student research studies. This way, other interested persons can come into the research area. In the discussion of the results, author has identified that the result agrees with other works such as: Albahali & Omran, [10], Rosenfield & Richman,[11] and Widmeyer & Ducharme,[12]. References The information used for writing the references was obtained from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413209708415388 I think they do correspond. It will be fine if the review can specifically identify areas of non-correspondence

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)* In relation to the research topic itself.	