

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 58405

Title: Legislating Corporate Social Responsibility in the Tanzanian Mining Sector: A Legal Pathway to Community Protection, Accountability and Sustainable Development.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript examines the legal justification for legislating Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Tanzania's mining sector, emphasizing community protection, institutional accountability, and sustainable development. Using qualitative legal research, including doctrinal analysis, documentary review, comparative analysis, and interviews with key stakeholders, the study argues that statutory CSR provides a stronger governance framework than voluntary corporate initiatives. The topic is timely and significant given the increasing global emphasis on responsible mining, environmental governance, and community rights.

The manuscript is comprehensive, well referenced, and presents a clear legal argument supported by recent legislation, judicial decisions, and empirical interview data. However, the paper is excessively lengthy, contains repetitive discussions, and requires improvements in methodological transparency, organization, critical balance, and language before publication. Therefore, **minor revision** is recommended.

Minor Comments

1. Novelty should be more explicitly stated

Although the manuscript presents a comprehensive legal analysis, the novelty is not sufficiently highlighted.

The authors should clearly explain:

- how this study differs from previous CSR governance studies,
- the unique contribution of integrating doctrinal legal analysis with qualitative interviews,
- the broader implications beyond the Tanzanian mining sector.

2. Research methodology requires greater detail

The methodology describes qualitative legal research and stakeholder interviews; however, additional information is required regarding:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- interview protocol,
- participant selection criteria,
- coding framework,
- thematic analysis procedures,
- measures taken to ensure credibility and minimize researcher bias.

These details will improve methodological rigor.

3. Discussion contains considerable repetition

Several arguments regarding:

- community protection,
- accountability,
- sustainable development,
- voluntary versus mandatory CSR,

are repeated across multiple sections.

The manuscript would benefit from condensing repetitive discussions while strengthening analytical synthesis.

4. Critical discussion should present alternative perspectives

The manuscript strongly advocates mandatory CSR legislation but provides limited discussion of potential challenges.

The authors should critically discuss:

- regulatory compliance costs,
- investment climate concerns,
- administrative burden,
- enforcement limitations,
- potential unintended consequences,
- lessons from jurisdictions where mandatory CSR has faced implementation challenges.

5. Comparative legal analysis should be expanded

The manuscript cites international literature but provides limited comparison with other countries implementing mandatory CSR frameworks.

Consider discussing experiences from:

- India,
- South Africa,
- Ghana,
- Australia,
- Canada,

to strengthen the comparative legal perspective.

6. Results and Discussion should be more concise

The Results and Discussion section extends over numerous pages with similar legal reasoning.

Consider restructuring the discussion into concise thematic sub-sections to improve readability and avoid redundancy.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

7. Policy recommendations should be more actionable

The manuscript concludes with general recommendations but could provide more specific guidance regarding:

- implementation mechanisms,
- monitoring frameworks,
- performance indicators,
- independent auditing,
- community grievance mechanisms,
- legislative amendments.

Minor Comments

Abstract

- Reduce lengthy background information.
- Clearly state the novelty and major legal contribution.
- Mention practical policy implications more explicitly.

Keywords

Consider adding:

- Mining law
- Extractive industries
- Environmental governance
- Human rights
- Sustainable mining
- Community participation

Introduction

The introduction provides a strong background but is relatively long.

Several paragraphs discussing CSR theory and governance can be condensed to improve focus.

Methodology

Include additional details regarding:

- interview duration,
- ethical approval,
- informed consent,
- coding software (if used),
- data saturation,
- triangulation process.

Results

Although well supported by literature and interview evidence, the discussion would benefit from:

- summary tables,
- conceptual diagrams,
- thematic flowcharts,
- graphical presentation of interview findings.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Figures and Tables

The manuscript currently lacks visual presentation.

Consider including:

- conceptual framework of mandatory CSR,
- legal governance framework,
- stakeholder interaction model,
- summary table of interview themes.

Language

The manuscript requires professional English editing.

Examples include:

- repetitive sentence structures,
- lengthy paragraphs,
- inconsistent punctuation,
- occasional grammatical errors,
- formatting inconsistencies.

References

The reference list is extensive and current.

However, please verify:

- APA formatting consistency,
- uniform DOI presentation,
- spacing,
- citation formatting,
- consistency in government legal citations.

Strengths

- Highly relevant and contemporary topic.
- Strong legal and policy foundation.
- Extensive use of recent literature.
- Comprehensive integration of legislation, case law, and empirical evidence.
- Well-structured legal arguments.
- Significant practical implications for mining governance and sustainable development.

Weaknesses

- Manuscript is excessively long.
- Considerable repetition across discussion sections.
- Limited presentation of counterarguments.
- Comparative legal analysis can be expanded.
- More methodological detail is required.
- Visual presentation (figures/tables) is absent.

Recommendation

Minor Revision