



**Paper: “Analysis of Online Newspapers’ Framing Patterns of COVID-19 in Nigeria”**

Corresponding Author: James Murunga

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p217

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stefan Vladutescu  
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Roselyn Ekundayo  
Canterbury Christ Church University, Kent, United Kingdom

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 31.08.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 08.07.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 13.07.2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Analysis of Online Newspaper’s Framing Patterns of COVID-19 in Nigeria</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31.07.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>This manuscript contains many typos that need to be eradicated. Some of the mistakes were marked on the manuscript, attached.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Are missing references from 2018-2020.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**This manuscript contains many typos that need to be eradicated. Some of the mistakes were marked on the manuscript, attached.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 30-June-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20-Jul-2020
Manuscript Title: Analysis of Online Newspaper's Framing Patterns of COVID-19 in Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31-07-2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Please consider the amendment on title as indicated on the manuscript</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Please consider the minor corrections on the abstract as indicated on the comments sections of the manuscript. However, the abstract is well constructed. It represents a brief but accurate summary of the study.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>The English writing is good but there are few grammatical and spelling errors. Please consider corrections in the manuscript.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The method is appropriate for the purpose of the study.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The body of the paper is clear but with some minor errors. Please consider comments on the manuscript.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are clear and represents a logical consequence of the analysis of the manuscript.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and updated sources were referred to in the manuscript.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**