

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2703
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Citizenship Practices for Social Media Users in the Virtual Space
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper is very important related to the Book scope. It gives some ideas on the role of social media platforms in promoting citizen safe practices for digital citizenship.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is appropriate for the book <i>Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research</i> . Indeed, the question of digital citizenship is very crucial in a perspective of global citizenship and 21st century skills for human wellbeing daily. So, it is a good topic in the trends of current progress in art and social studies research.	
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 provides a broad overview of the study's aim and context. Yet, it lacks details on the methodology (research design and data collection tools). I would suggest the structure; Aim, methods, findings, recommendations/perspectives.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub-sections are appropriate even if the findings could be organized in two sub-sections according to items or quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Moreover, the methods section can be improved according to the comments in the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically correct and interesting. Except the need to take into consideration suggestions according to the sub-sections, literature review and the methods. It is an interesting paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This paper needs English language edition.	
Optional/General comments	It is an interesting topic. Yet, a revision is required in the full text according to comments added. Moreover, it could be usefull to increase the text length. It is too short and many new ideas could improve the value of the paper . All the comments are in the text and could help the author (s) to improve the paper quality as an interesting book chapter.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saman Ange-Michel Gougou
Department, University & Country	University Alassane Ouattara, Cote d'Ivoire