

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_112277
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT ON NEWSPAPER REPORTAGE ON JULIUS NYERERE HYDROPOWER PROJECT: A CASE OF MWANANCHI AND HABARILEO NEWSPAPERS
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:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is a case study of a number of publications about the Hydropower project and that is why important to the scientific community. The application of context analysis techniques revealed an imbalance in the use of news sources, with a bias towards government sources in the reporting process. This explains the omission in the analysed publications of vital aspects that the public wants to know about in relation to government projects and policies.</p> <p>2. The title of the article fully reflects the goals and methods of the research.</p> <p>3. The abstract quite fully reveals the objectives of the research and the results obtained.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is quite well structured. The main subsections reflect the history of the problem and the sequence of research tasks.</p> <p>5. I believe that the conclusions obtained are justified using qualitative and quantitative methods for analyzing the texts of publications.</p> <p>6. The work presents about 50 references from 1972 to 2023, which likely reflect the history of the Hydropower project's development.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Anna Bakurova
Department, University & Country	National University Zaporizhzhia Polytechnic, Ukraine