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| 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.** | I like this manuscript.1. This research integrates two theories and one framework, breaking through the limitations of a single theoretical perspective and deeply understanding the complex relationship between stakeholder reputation and social exchange. 2. Adopting a bottom-up approach, it attaches great importance to the voices of local communities and stakeholders and combines the actual situation in South Africa to construct a decolonized reputation management framework. 3. Focusing on the field of local government reputation management, it provides empirical and theoretical bases for understanding reputation dynamics and management, and helps local governance. 4. The construction of the decolonized framework is innovative, providing an example for the diversification and inclusiveness of academic research and promoting the progress of related disciplines. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, I think the current title is a very concise summary of the core elements of the paper's research, reflecting the research object and scope. |  |
| 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. | I think the present abstract highlights the topic, methodology and main findings of the study. However, relevant information about the sample can be appropriately supplemented. Although feedback from the analysis community is mentioned, the source, collection method and sample size of the sample are not detailed. For example, The summary may contain a brief reference to "Community feedback was gathered from public forums, community meetings, and social media groups with a total of 10 instances analysed ", which can give readers a more comprehensive understanding of the data base of the study and enhance the credibility of the study. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | Yes. |  |
| **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 exhibits scientific correctness in several ways. Firstly, it is underpinned by established theories such as the Stakeholder Theory, Reputation Management Frameworks, and Social Exchange Theory, which provide a solid theoretical foundation for the research. This indicates that the study is grounded in recognized concepts and principles within the field, enhancing its scientific robustness. Secondly, the use of a qualitative content analysis approach to analyse community feedback is a technically sound method. It allows for in-depth exploration and identification of patterns and themes in media representation, providing rich and detailed data. Moreover, the purposive sampling technique employed to select relevant community feedback ensures that the data collected is relevant and focused on the research question at hand. Additionally, the acknowledgement of the study's limitations, such as the qualitative nature and single-case focus, shows a level of scientific integrity. It not only provides transparency but also paves the way for future research to address these limitations and build upon the current findings. Overall, these aspects contribute to the scientific correctness and technical soundness of the manuscript. |  |
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| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | This manuscript studies the reputation management of the local municipality of Amaharati and has a certain scientific legitimacy. The positive aspects include proper application of theory and reasonable structure; On the negative side, the language is not accurate enough and the quotation format is not uniform, so there is room for improvement in the overall language quality to better meet the needs of academic communication. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Although the limitations of qualitative research methods and single case studies are mentioned, they can be further expanded, such as more detailed elaboration from the aspects of sample representation, limitations of data collection methods, and research time range, so as to better reflect the rigor of the research and guide significance for future research. For example, the data collection time is only 1 month, it is difficult to capture the reputation changes of ALM in different periods and policy cycles, although it is said to ensure saturation and reduce bias, but there are still limitations; Only 10 community feedback examples were analyzed, with a small sample size, which makes it difficult to cover all kinds of views in the community. Although it claims to have a comprehensive understanding of ALM reputation changes, it may not represent community diversity and affect sample typicality. |  |
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