Paper: **"Artificial Intelligence and Fact Checking in Africa: Between the Logic of Dependency and the Limits of Automation"**

Corresponding Author: Sokhna Fatou Seck Sarr

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Takafumi Mizuno
Meijo University, Japan

Reviewer 2: Elda Xhumari
Universiteti I Tiranës Fakulteti I Shkencave Të Natyrës, Albania

Reviewer 3: Eirini Bizmpiki
Panteion University, Greece

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear ans explains briefly the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract best describes the objects and methods of the fact checking in africa

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No errors detected

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Study methods explained clearly

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

No errors detected in the body of the paper. Subject is interestingly covered however in order for content to be understood completely the reared requires to have basic knowledge of AI. Perhaps a possible explanation and methods with emphasis on a small introduction stressing the means and ways of fact checking's correlation with AI would be needed.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion explains drastically the correlation of fact checking and AI

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Very informative list of references with emphasis on authors

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The paper provides a comprehensive examination of the intersection between artificial intelligence (AI), fact-checking, and the African context.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The paper offers valuable insights into the complex dynamics of AI-based fact-checking in Africa and provides a solid foundation for further research in this area. With some refinement in organization, conciseness, critical engagement, and language, it has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field. It delves deeply into various aspects of the subject matter, including economic dependencies, technical implementation, and the limitations of automation in fact-checking initiatives in Africa. The use of theories such as the political economy of communication, platform studies, and AI provides a robust theoretical foundation for understanding the dynamics at play. The combination of content analysis and distanced observation of fact-checking platforms adds depth to the study and allows for a nuanced understanding of the issues.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The paper would benefit from careful proofreading for language and style, particularly in terms of clarity and precision of expression.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The combination of content analysis and distanced observation of fact-checking platforms adds depth to the study and allows for a nuanced understanding of the issues.
The paper could benefit from clearer organization and structure, particularly in the presentation of the theoretical framework and methodological approach. Clear section headings and subheadings would help guide the reader through the paper more effectively.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Some sections of the paper are verbose and could be condensed to improve readability without sacrificing depth of analysis.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

While the paper presents a wealth of information and analysis, it could be strengthened by more effectively integrating findings from different sections and drawing clearer connections between them.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

While the paper provides a detailed overview of the subject matter, it could further benefit from critical engagement with the literature and the data presented. This could involve more explicit discussion of the implications of the findings and potential areas for further research.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper could benefit from clearer organization and structure, particularly in the presentation of the theoretical framework and methodological approach. Clear section headings and subheadings would help guide the reader through the paper more effectively. Some sections of the paper are verbose and could be condensed to improve readability without sacrificing depth of analysis. While the paper presents a wealth of information and analysis, it could be strengthened by more effectively integrating findings from different sections and drawing clearer connections between them.

While the paper provides a detailed overview of the subject matter, it could further benefit from critical engagement with the literature and the data presented. This could involve more explicit discussion of the implications of the findings and potential areas for further research. The paper would benefit from careful proofreading for language and style, particularly in terms of clarity and precision of expression.

Reviewer L:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is enough to grasp the contents.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract sufficiently summarizes the whole paper.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I cannot find grammatical errors or tipos.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The author should describe that the style of the paper is a survey or meta-analysis rather than an experiment.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

In the Introduction, It is preferred that the author describes what companies GAFAM consists of.
Facebook has changed its name to Meta. The author must complementarily describe it in a footnote and so on.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

It is clear.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

They are enough.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed