

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>)

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. The manuscript is crucial for scientific community because it purely addresses current issues on social media in internal communication inside the organization and the area for the study is much useful. 2. The title of the article is suitable and relevant. 3. The abstract of the study is well structured and understandable, it captured various aspects of the article in summary. 4. The Subsections and structure of the manuscript are good; however, the researcher could add more under the literature review. 5. YES 6. The references are current and sufficient 7. The researcher should touch more on the managerial implications as well. 	Th
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. YES 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Manuscript was prepared comprehensively, yet researcher should improve the methodology of the work.</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:	Richmond Adu-Poku
Department, University & Country	Akenten Appiah-Menka University of Skill Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Ghana