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This is an interesting paper that looks at the case of Zimbabwean youtube video content as a vehicle of undemocratic, alternative discourses. It adds to the research that investigates how social media platforms are used to incite antagonism.

The author pulls together some relevant and important works in the literature, although some in-text citations seem to be missing from the references, e.g., Mhiripiri and Mutsvairo, 2013; Chatora, 2012; Moyo, 2020; Margetts, 2018; Chitiyo, 2003.

The author introduces some concepts well, e.g., the definition and role of cartoon, although a clear section of literature review that's set apart from the introduction should make it easier for readers to locate key information.

Some other terms, e.g., counter-hegemonic and subaltern public spheres, aren't as clearly defined. Because the analysis alludes to the binary narratives produced in the youtube content, it'd help to know what the hegemony is and how as well as what makes something subaltern in this context.

On that note, I think the Fraser (1994) quote on page 9 (right before the conclusion) would be useful for that purpose. The author might consider moving this paragraph earlier in the paper to lay a clearer and stronger conceptual ground.

For the analysis, the author includes some interesting and illustrative examples. The analysis itself, however, is at times descriptive. I'd encourage the author to dig a bit deeper and make more connections between the examples and the literature that's been reviewed.

Finally, there's quite some language issues, including run-ons and fragments, and typographical errors, e.g., “on the other habd” in the conclusion. The author needs to check the text again and have it proofread so that the language is easy to understand.

I believe this paper would benefit from some major revision. The premise looks promising; the author just needs to make some refinement. I wish them the best with this publication.