

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_110093
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Social Networks as Forums for Political Debates in Tanzania: A Case of Chama Cha Mapinduzi and Chadema Tanzania Twitter Platforms
Type of the Article	

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. I assess that this manuscript contains a solid scientific study, providing up-to-date information in the field of political communication, particularly through social media.</p> <p>2. I find the title quite captivating, but it might be worth considering changing the word 'assessment' to 'evaluation' or 'analysis.'</p> <p>3. My first question would be, is the abstract not too lengthy? Could it be condensed with better content density, making it easier for readers to understand without diminishing its scientific value? Additionally, is there a need to provide further explanation regarding the selection of a specific timeframe for the research?</p> <p>4. We believe the writing structure is already quite good.</p> <p>5. Yes, certainly. It already encompasses a specific scientific study within the scope of social science.</p> <p>6. Regarding the number of cited references, it is sufficient. However, could the references used be publications from the last five years? I believe this would provide more recent knowledge and align better with your research. You have used many references that are over 10 years old. Furthermore, please check the bibliography writing rules, adjusting them according to the guidelines issued by this journal's publisher!</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Our suggestion, for this manuscript to be reviewed again, there are several sections that, in our opinion, are still unclear, especially regarding formal writing or adherence to correct grammar.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Our suggestion would be, it would be more engaging to include a chart or an illustration in this writing so that everything is not solely focused on narration.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angkasa Putra
Department, University & Country	Pukyong National University, South Korea