

Paper: “Social Media for Sustainable Development: Challenging Participatory Development Practices to Re-learn and Realign Stakeholder Practices in Tamale Metropolis, Ghana”

Submitted: 26 February 2023

Accepted: 29 April 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Jonas K. Fiadzawoo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p35](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p35)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stefan Vladutescu
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Stefan Vladutescu	
University/Country: University of Craiova/ Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 10.03.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.03.2023
Manuscript Title: Social Media for Sustainable Development: Challenging Participatory Development Practices to Re-learn and Realign Stakeholder Practices in Tamale Metropolis, Ghana	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.03.2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

<i>The title of the manuscript reflects its content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract correctly retains the objective, theme, method of investigation and research results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>It would be good for the manuscript to be read by a native English speaker.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method used is appropriate to the topic approached.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are relevant.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions of the manuscript are based on the investigation carried out.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>It is necessary to update the bibliography with 2-4 relevant works from 2022, 2023.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript needs to be completed with a "Future research" section.

It is necessary to update the bibliography with relevant 2-4 works from 2022 and 2023.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: