

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. This manuscript important to scientific community, because the topic take issue about politics digital which is being widely discussed</p> <p>2. The title of the article Adequately describes the issues discussed</p> <p>3. The abstract in this study has included several important things. starting from the background, theory, methods, research findings. But it seems necessary to add the implications of this research. In order to be more comprehensive and significant the findings of this research</p> <p>4. Yes, appropriate</p> <p>5. It is quite correct, but there needs to be improvements in some parts such as the introduction and discussion.</p> <p>6. Regarding the references used, it is necessary to add articles that are important regarding the discussion of this topic such as Vergeer, M., & Hermans, L. (2013)., Boulianne, S. (2015), Stieglitz, S., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2013) etc.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. English quality this manuscript it's good enough</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This script does a good job of explaining the issues and discussing them in an interesting discussion. However, there needs to be a little improvement in several parts such as in the introduction, the author needs to write a statement why this research is important to carry out. then, in the discussion section there is no in-depth discussion related to the problem being discussed with a clash of theories or findings of previous studies. even though this is important in the context of scientific discussion.</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:	Dimas Subekti
Department, University & Country	Universitas Jambi, Indonesia