



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>)

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	<p>ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DESIGN OF METRIC TO IDENTIFY KEY OPINION LEADERS IN RESEARCH</p> <p>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:</p> <p>-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?</p> <p>Are the results obtained compared with other quantitative and qualitative methods?</p> <p>-References: Review, please, the rules of the Journal.</p> <p>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</p> <p>But it does not correspond to the one found at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413209708415388</p> <p>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</p> <p>-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)</p>	
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	<p>ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DESIGN OF METRIC TO IDENTIFY KEY OPINION LEADERS IN RESEARCH</p> <p>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:</p> <p>-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?</p> <p>Are the results obtained compared with other quantitative and qualitative methods?</p> <p>-References: Review, please, the rules of the Journal.</p> <p>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</p> <p>But it does not correspond to the one found at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413209708415388</p> <p>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</p> <p>-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)</p>	
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>In relation to the research topic itself.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose Luis Turabian
Department, University & Country	Health Service of Castilla la Mancha, Spain