



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. The paper is not well presented in the English language.</p> <p>2. The paper does not deliver the evidence as suggested in the title and abstract. The functionality of the government is supposed to be demonstrated through the eyes of ordinary citizens, but this does not appear to be the case. Citizens from one of the nine provinces were selected for interviews, but beyond that we know little about them (what is the demographic makeup of the sample) or how they were selected. The evidence of government dysfunction appears to come from government reports, the media, academics, and politicians. Evidence is presented from Statistics South Africa, but I do not know if this is a government agency or an independent research organization. Wikipedia is used as a source of information, but I do not trust it to be reliable.</p>	<p>1.Thanks for the language that is clear</p> <p>2. Matters attended to in this part of review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence added as suggested in abstract and title by adding other voices of ordinary citizens that were left out. - Explanation on the sampled participants is clarified and each was also taken with where they were met to comment in the province. However, their real identity has been with hold for confidentiality. - Evidence of government inefficiency as stipulated in coverage of different media houses are reflection of what is happening in communities, however, voices of more ordinary persons that were left out have been added now. Statistics SA is government institution and this has been indicated on the document. Wikipedia has been removed as information it covered was also covered by the Zondo commission on State Capture.