

Review of: "Exploring the Role of Social, Economic, and Cultural Factors in Community Development: A Social Work Perspective in T/A Chimwala, Mangochi"

Ernest Alang Wung¹

¹ Université de Dschang

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for this chance given to contribute to the amelioration of this manuscript.

Dear Authors, permit me highlight my contributions in point form

- The manuscript touches an important aspect in the domain of social works especially as it redirect itself to community development in the case of Traditional Authorities in Chimwala, Mangochi. However, the following lapses can't be overlooked:

1. The gap spoken of in paragraph 3 lines 7-14 is doubtful as to how and where presence are the extant works discussed to make such statements. If scholarly works are scanty on this subject matter and authors simply wants to replicate what literature has document in other contexts and not that of T/A Chimwala, it is predominant to spell it out as a gap. Or better still, if there's any form of argument in the social works literature that has no consensus, authors should clearly indicate the gap the current study is coming to fill in.

2. The logic of presenting the gap and methodology isn't comprehensible; we see in paragraph 1 lines 8-9 authors evoking Kapucu (2012) as an affirmative study on social works being a cornerstone that can foster positive change in the development of a community. Next phrase, "The study delves into the intricate interplay of ..." and in paragraph 1 lines 4-5 of section 2 (methodology) we hear another "...the study delves into the intricate interplay of ..." Such phrases makes the readership of the work redundant and indicate poor rigor in:

- The review of extant works
- The lack of an existing theoretical underpinning
- Complete reliance on a few extant works that have been done elsewhere in similar scenarios and what is to be done now is just reduplicate them in Chimwala
- This doesn't show signs of rigor in the literature nor in the method because it seems since authors like Kapucu (2012) and Kothari (2004) document positive issues on the subject matter we simply should follow suit without an argument or discussion of such findings

Thus, the manuscript lacks, rigor, a nuance from others, theoretical background and/or underpinning

3. Since the study employed both probability and non-probability sampling techniques, please can authors highlight:

- **How** and
- **Where**, respondents were reached out to?

This is predominant because information has been given as **to who** were the respondents; people of age 18 and above but we don't know how they were reached out to, where they were reached out (market place, in the palace, over the phones, at home or where?), how many people responded to the questionnaire and how many were interviewed, and what was the total sample size with the response rate of the study?

- How were the questionnaire items (questions) constructed?
- How were respondent to answer this questions? Where they any filter in the questionnaire that could help in eliminating or outsourcing outliers?
- What was the total population (sample) of men-women or women-men proportion?

4. The presentation of results is and manner of discussing them is really not worth it. Why are results presented in several facets; social, economic, and cultural factors, socioeconomic, socioeconomic and cultural factors? Where and how come corruption emerges whereas we neither have seen nor mentioned it as a possible factor?

5. Discussing each latent such as lack of participation, lack of resources, corruption, structure of society, among others will mean we discuss those found in figure 2 and figure 3 as well. Why limit to discussing the latent of figure 1 only?

However, discussing separately each of this latent is not logical because await a discussion from the perspective of social, economic, and cultural dimension with the latent explained if necessary with the discussion.

6. Are the findings contrasting or affirming any extant findings, what are or is the limitation of the study? Authors should at least show the limitation so as to pave a way for future studies. This is adequate because authors raised that they are potential limitations in lines 9-11 of paragraph 2 of the methodology, they as well pinpoint limitations at the conclusion but without clearly stating what these/this limitation(s) are

General remark

Judging this manuscript globally, there's still much to do at the review section, gap discovering, methodology, results presentations and discussions with the conclusion. Much courage to authors