

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_110096
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Government's e-Communication in Tanzania: Survey of Dar es Salaam Residents
Type of the Article	Research

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>	<p>Yes, the manuscript contributes to the existing literature by providing interesting empirical data from an emerging context (e.g., Tanzania) on e-government services.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Too many and the author(s) need to focus on the references most relevant to the topic of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: As it stands, it misses a lot of important points. It should briefly and clearly include the research questions, literature gap(s), data collection methods, theoretical framework used to analyse the data, main findings, and structure of the manuscript. 2. Literature review: It is very descriptive, study after study. Your literature review should be written critically. This will help journal readers understand the international debate surrounding the manuscript topic, and clearly identify your literature gap(s). 3. Methodology: It focuses only on data collection methods. However, there is no clear discussion about the theoretical framework or model used to analyse the empirical data. 4. Results and discussion: You have good and interesting results. However, you should frame these results within a specific theoretical framework. This will help make the results meaningful and make your theoretical contributions clear to the literature. It may also be a good idea to devote a separate section to the discussion. In this separate section, you should discuss your results alongside previous literature. This will help readers understand your agreement and disagreement with the literature. 5. Conclusions and recommendations: It may be better to combine the two sections into one section to reflect the summary of results, practical and social implications, and research limitations that pave the way for future research projects. 	
<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.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please see my comments above.</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:	Loai Alsaïd
Department, University & Country	School of Economics, Finance and Accounting, Coventry University, United Kingdom