

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_112283
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Social Media Landscape on organizational Internal Communication: A study on Government Chemist Laboratory Authority
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>)

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance to Scientific Community: The manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the transformative impact of social media on internal communication within the organizational context, specifically focusing on the Government Chemist Laboratory Authority (GCLA). 2. Title Suitability: The current title effectively conveys the central theme but introduces the term "impact," potentially creating an expectation that is not met by the study. To accurately reflect the study's nature, it is recommended to refine the title to exclude the term "impact." The suggested alternative title better aligns with the exploratory nature of the study. 3. Comprehensiveness of Abstract: The abstract provides a comprehensive overview, outlining objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. Strengthening the abstract by acknowledging the study's limitations and emphasizing the need for a more robust quantitative approach to assess impact would enhance its balance and guide readers on the study's scope and limitations. 4. Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: While the subsections and overall structure contribute to a logical flow, there is a lack of methodological detail and insufficient presentation of quantitative data, impacting rigor. Thematic presentation of findings aligned with the study objectives would create a clearer and logically organized narrative. 5. Scientific Accuracy: While the manuscript is scientifically grounded in theory, concerns about methodological transparency, result presentation clarity, and the alignment of study objectives with the title, results, and conclusions are noted. The title suggests an impact assessment that is not realized in the study. The conclusions do not logically align with the stated objectives in the introduction; findings are not well outlined and consistent with objectives and conclusions reached to help the reader understand the issues espoused, posing challenges in confirming the scientific accuracy of the study. A more cohesive presentation of findings and a clear connection to the stated objectives are essential for scientific accuracy. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent?: References are generally sufficient, covering relevant studies. To enhance completeness, recent literature on methodological aspects of qualitative research and social media impact studies is recommended. Incorporating references discussing longitudinal study designs and quantitative assessments would further contribute to scientific rigor. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>While the majority of the paper is well-written, there are certain aspects that require refinement to ensure heightened rigor, reliability, and validity. The methodological description lacks the necessary details to instill confidence in the study's reliability. While the choice of a qualitative approach is reasonable, elucidating the rationale behind the sampling method and justifying the sample size would enhance the overall methodological transparency, especially considering the stated objective of providing a quantitative understanding.</p> <p>A pivotal objective of the research was to "examine the extent of social media usage for internal communication, providing a quantitative understanding of its prevalence at GCLA." However, the presented results do not sufficiently incorporate quantitative data to elucidate the nuances at GCLA. The use of the phrase "a sizeable percentage" introduces ambiguity and does not contribute to methodological rigor. Given the modest sample size of 40 and the explicit objective to offer a quantitative perspective, it is imperative to present precise percentages derived from the observed sample.</p> <p>Additionally, the thematic findings from the qualitative study, aligning with the Uses and Gratifications Theory, merit discussion and inclusion in the conclusion. As the study is anchored in this theoretical framework, incorporating these themes into the conclusion would provide a more comprehensive synthesis of the research findings. This adjustment would contribute to the overall coherence and strength of the study.</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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cynthia Naa Anyimah Botchway
Department, University & Country	University of the Virgins Island, USA