

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_110098
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions on the Performance of Media against Corruption in Tanzania: A survey of Ubungo Municipality residents in Dar es Salaam
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 topic of the manuscript is important. However, the manuscript is short and needs significant development to make theoretical and empirical contributions to the literature.</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: It is a short section. You should expand your results and frame them within a meaningful conceptual framework to make your theoretical contributions visible. 5. Discussion: It sounds like part of your literature review. In this section, you should clearly present your main results with a critical discussion of previous studies. 6. 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 Alsaid
Department, University & Country	School of Economics, Finance and Accounting, Coventry University, United Kingdom