

Review of: "Corralling a Chimera: A Critical Review of the Term Social Infrastructure"

Danvas Mabeya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Let me start by saying I was excited to review your article. The study contains very interesting ideas about "Corralling a Chimera: A Critical Review of the Term Social Infrastructure." However, the author (s) ideas are not clearly stated to compel an argument that contributes to the field of scholarship that can be published in a peer reviewed academic journal.

First, the very important issue is I struggled to locate your research question (s). I.e. Why is this paper being written? What is the purpose of the research? What exactly is being investigated and why? Why is this particular research important, in spite of what has been done? What are the specific objectives? For example, the research may not aim to be groundbreaking but it may intend to show more examples of social infrastructure that has not been documented by other scholars. This can also form the basis for further research, development. How have societies tried to overcome those challenges. The research question should be the center and guiding tool for your investigation and should have appeared before your Literature Review. All your other arguments, discussions, analysis and conclusions should rotate around your research question and other subsidiary questions. More so, the research problem that should lead the investigation of this study is not clear. Did you want to investigate lack of necessary social infrastructure? The research question(s) should address the fundamental question of how important social infrastructure is to society and what societies have done to compensate for that. All this should be carefully explained in the introduction

Second, the theoretical grounding and analytical insights missing or are particularly weak. The manuscript would benefit from some clarification and development of theoretical concepts used. Without conceptual/theoretical frameworks, the paper is reduced to just a description of a situation and not academic. Essentially, conceptual/theoretical frameworks are the basis or cornerstone of making an argument or a case.

Third, the method of any paper is the backbone of proper argument and analysis. It is the bread and butter of a paper. Once the author weakens the method, then the analysis becomes weak and vague. There should be a couple of phrases explaining why these particular methodologies (secondary data collection, qualitative research, multiple case studies etc...) have been chosen to facilitate this research, considering its a descriptive. The author(s) mention mixed-methods approach and use of data visualization. Explain in depth this area. Did you use any software? Further, this does not appear under the methodology. Tell the readers how long it took you to collect data. Were you funded?

Fourth, the author(s) should present concrete findings and offer an academic analysis which leads to a conclusion. Starting with a summary of the main findings and/or discussion points, as well as a couple of statements about Corraling a Chimera.

Fifth, the conclusion needs to be more complete. The conclusion is not clearly stated. The conclusion should be more extensive offering substantial solutions, recommendations and even further research. This is part of the responsibility of the author(s) apart from collecting data, explaining, discussing and analyzing information.

For the author(s)

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to review your work. While my comments are not meant to be a discouragement, the paper needs a little revision and in-depth discussion/explanation in research question, theory, methodology, analysis and conclusions. Overall, the paper comes from a very promising study, it is understandable, likely to be published. The recommendations that I made here are made with the intention of assisting further revision and streamlining the article to make it ready for publication. I hope you take them positively.

To the editors

The study represents an immensely interesting topic. However, from my review, the research question, theory, methodology, analysis and conclusions need some reworking. The theory and analysis are weak. The conclusion does sum up the paper but does not provide a clear analysis and conclusion that can be used in academia. The research question is not clearly stated. Overall, the study has high potential to be published with some revisions as I noted to the

author(s). For these reasons, I have recommended the article be revised and resubmitted.