

Review of: "Animation and YouTube as Alternative and Counterhegemonic Digital Public Sphere in Zimbabwe"

Ricardo Vizcaíno Pérez¹

¹ Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is suggested to give the text a traditional scientific structure, with sections such as "background, hypothesis, objectives, methodology, results and conclusions"

The conclusions should emerge from the research results. For example, when it is stated that "This paper has noted that the 2013 election ushered in the use of socialmedia for political campaign purposes in Zimbabwe", is this known "scientifically"? Didn't this happen before 2013? Is there data to confirm it?

Especially the methodology should be well explained. It could be considered a "case study" (3 examples are taken and commented). But why those 3 examples? There's no more? Are they the most relevant?

I think the text sufficiently explains what happens with YouTube as an alternative, but from the "scientific" point of view as it is currently handled in Social Sciences it needs to include the modifications of the first paragraph.