

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_110406
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES FACING GOVERNMENT COMMUNICATION OFFICERS IN DAR ES SALAAM CITY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community</p> <p>I think that the title is clumsy. I will suggest Government Communication Officers and their challenges in Dar es Salam: A Critical Analysis</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but needs to be reworked to avoid clumsy sentences</p> <p>The subsections are appropriate; however, the author needs to be clear on the organization of the study. For example, subthemes can be highlighted eg. 1. introduction. 2. Conceptual Analysis. 2.1 Communication Officer 2.2 Functions of Communication Officer in Dar es Salam. E.t.c. As such, it will guide the reader on the author's perspectives</p> <p>I think the references can be updated. This I think will further enrich the study – as recent studies may have identified more challenges or provided solutions to the author's findings</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>I think the author will need to use Grammarly to identify errors in the study. There are more typographical errors in the author's communication to the reader. This makes the study rather difficult to understand. The quality can be better if it is reworked</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study tends to produce rich knowledge on the challenges confronted by Government Communication Officers in Dar es Salam, but the author has not been explicit on case selections that specifically speak to these challenges. For example, is it in the public sector of health, communication, etc.? If the author is specific to a particular sector, generalization can be possible. Moreover, with the targeted respondents, the author can focus on the scope (answering to time and place in Dar es Salam).</p> <p>Again, in the choice of methodology, I think the author does not need to give background information to Dar es Salam but rather be explicit about why Dar es Salam. Which local council in the selected area and why?</p> <p>At the same time, I am not sure 14 respondents will be the appropriate sample frame for the population. It is not representative enough for a scientific study....there is an error in the sample</p> <p>While the ethics are maintained, the author I believe may be a graduate student of the University, but his area of study is still questionable. If the author got permission to engage in the fieldwork, then what organization is his audience? Does the audience represent a particular sector of the government or all sectors? If it is all sectors, 14 interviewees seem less representative of the Communication Officers in Dar es Salam</p> <p>In the findings, the author was specific to ICT but where? In which organization?</p> <p>Again, if the author used IDI and intends to maintain the anonymity of the respondent, I think he/she can be creative to maintain this stance of the respondent. In the body of the work, respondents'</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>views can be used as (IDI/2023). This will enable the researcher to have a clear perspective that it is a response (the institution or organization of the respondent can also be abbreviated)</p> <p>Abbreviations like ICT, and CMT should first be fully written; then afterwards abb maintained</p> <p>If the author prefers to use the alphabet to represent respondents, let it be clear and precise for all.</p> <p>I also think that the findings can be in subsections/subthemes. It will guide the reader and avoid clumsiness. Though the author tried to use subtopics.... it will be clumsy for a reader who has not taken the time to read from A to Z of the manuscript. I think that if a reader picks to read the published article, he or she should be able to understand the views of the author without necessarily going through the entire study. Eg, if the author was looking at budget constraints, common guidelines e.t.c as other challenges, it is already clumsy when the major subtheme of Challenges have not been identified in this section</p> <p>At the same time, before the conclusion, it is appropriate to have a concluding remark from the author, thereby capturing all that has been identified from the fieldwork. This will properly lead to the conclusion of the study.</p> <p>The recommendation, I think is too brief. It could be improved on. Eg. What is the role of Dar es Salam in addressing these identified challenges? What should be the reactions of the Communication officers and the general public?</p> <p>Reference I think is not following a specific format. If the author intends to use APA or any other, this will make the organization of the study more scholarly.</p> <p>Above all, I think the author has done a good study that needs to be improved on for better enrichment of scholarship.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oluwatunmise Taiwo Paimo
Department, University & Country	Crescent University, Nigeria