

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJARR_130524 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Systematic review on public relations strategies in Ghanaian Universities. |
| Type of the Article | Review article |

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community, particularly by contributing to the existing body of knowledge on public relations within the context of universities in Ghana through the compilation of previous studies. It may serve as a foundation for the theoretical advancement of public relations in Ghanaian universities. Such theoretical development can provide guidance for improvement and enable public relations units to better understand and effectively serve all stakeholders involved. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | I believe the title of the article is not appropriate, as it does not align with the characteristics of a systematic review, but rather resembles a general review. Therefore, I would recommend that the author replace “systematic review” with “review.” A suggested alternative title is: “A Review of Public Relations Strategies in Universities in Ghana.” | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract of the article is too long, as it typically should contain between 150-250 words, but it exceeds 300 words. The author should focus on the public relations strategies, as indicated in the article’s title, rather than the corporate image. Additionally, the abstract should avoid citations and instead present key findings from the compilation of previous studies. The methodology should also be included in the abstract. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | No, the article requires a methodology to guide the review of previous studies. The sections of the article are disorganised, which causes the overall focus to be unclear. Therefore, the author should carefully reorganise the article to ensure better coherence. The Literature Review section should instead present the Results/Findings of the article, as the key findings are not clearly articulated. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The previous studies included in the review are acceptable; however, I found more recent studies on public relations in universities in Ghana. Therefore, the article should provide a justification and a clear explanation of the selection process for the studies included in the review within the Methodology section. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | No. A grammatical and sentence structure review is needed. The paragraphs are too lengthy, and several sections of the article are presented in bullet points. | |
| Optional/General comments | The article should be reorganised to enhance its academic presentation. Incorporating tables or figures could help make it more visually appealing and clearer in highlighting the key points and findings. | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | 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) |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name: | Siti Aishah Chu binti Abdullah |
| Department, University & Country | Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Malaysia |