

Manuscript: “**Evaluation of Knowledge and Belief on False Reports and Misinformation from Social Media in COVID-19 Pandemic: A Web Based Cross-Sectional Survey in Karachi, Pakistan**”

**Submitted: 17 August 2020**

**Accepted: 18 December 2020**

**Published: 31 December 2020**

Corresponding Author: Shehroz Shahid

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p8

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Stefan Vladutescu,  
Romania

**Reviewer 2:** Jestoni D. Maniago,  
Majmaah University / KSA

**Reviewer 3:** Babatunde Ezekiel Olusegun,  
Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan

## ***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: 20.10.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 27.10.2020
--------------------------------------	--

Manuscript Title: **Role of Social Media in False Reporting and Spreading Misinformation in COVID-19 Pandemic; a Web Based Cross-Sectional Survey in Karachi, Pakistan**

ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.09.2020

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>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
This manuscript article should be examined by a native Englishman, as I have identified some inaccuracies, for example, in the section "Conclusion" instead of "The study" should be replaced with "This study".	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</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>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The bibliography of the manuscript is cited incorrectly. Here are some examples:</i>	
<p>1. Ali, S. M., Hashmi, A., &amp; Hussain, T. J. P. J. o. P. S. (2020). Causes and treatment of Covid-19: Myths vs Facts. 33(4).</p>	
<i>correct is</i>	
<p>Ali, S. M., Hashmi, A., &amp; Hussain, T. (2020). Causes and treatment of Covid-19: Myths vs Facts. <i>Pakistan Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences</i>, 33(4).</p>	
<p>Guastalegname, M., &amp; Vallone, A. J. C. I. D. (2020). Could chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine be harmful in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment?</p>	
<i>correct is</i>	
<p>Guastalegname, M., &amp; Vallone, A. (2020). Could chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine be harmful in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treatment?. <i>Clinical Infectious Diseases</i>.</p>	

**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):**

- a) This manuscript is good, but the bibliography is cited incorrectly. It is necessary that the bibliography be cited with all the identification data of the sources. So it is necessary for the authors to make small corrections.
- b) This manuscript article should be examined by a native Englishman, as I have identified some inaccuracies, for example, in the section "Conclusion" instead of "The study" should be replaced with "This study".

## ***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!***

Reviewer Name: Jestoni D. Maniago	Email:
University/Country: Majmaah University / KSA	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 Oct 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 Oct 2020
Manuscript Title: Role of Social Media in False Reporting and Spreading Misinformation in COVID-19 Pandemic: A Web-based Cross Sectional Survey in Karachi, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0904/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/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>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The title does not match with the study findings. The authors reported on participants’ demographic profile, attitudes/behaviors toward COVID-19 reports in social media, and circulating myths about COVID-19 in social media. I have not read anything about the role of social media in false reporting and spreading misinformation about COVID-19.</li> </ul>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The authors need detailed research background. The background mentioned do not have much to do with the study purpose.</li> <li>The necessity of research in this community and also the use of these variables is not clear.</li> </ul>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling</b>	

<b>mistakes in this article.</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors need to do grammar check.</li> <li>• I found some syntax issues which can be improved by submitting this paper for English language editing.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<p>The authors need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• include the total population in Karachi City</li> <li>• determine where the IRB approval was secured</li> <li>• determine the descriptive rating of the Likert scale</li> <li>• identify the validity and reliability of the survey questionnaire used</li> </ul>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors need to separate the discussion from the results section.</li> <li>• The main question pertaining to the role of social media in false reporting and spreading misinformation, false figures and myths in COVID-19 pandemic was not answered.</li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion is not according to the study findings.</li> </ul>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DOI for each reference is not included.</li> </ul>	

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

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

## ***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!*

Reviewer Name: Dr. Babatunde, Ezekiel Olusegun	Email:
University/Country: Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 <sup>th</sup> November, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30 <sup>th</sup> November, 2020
Manuscript Title: Role of Social Media in False Reporting and Spreading Misinformation in COVID-19 Pandemic; a Web Based Cross-Sectional Survey in Karachi, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0904/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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>
The title is not clear as many other things were imported which is outside the scope of the title. Author(s) must restructure the title or remove what was not part of the title in the body of the work. Author(s) may consider: Evaluation of Knowledge and Belief of False Reporting and Misinformation in COVID-19 Pandemic through Social Media: A Web-Based Cross-sectional Survey in Karachi, Pakistan.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
There are missing gaps in the abstracts as pointed out in the work. There is need to revisit the abstracts and include the needful.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
The work will require the services of an editor for it to be published	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
The methodology is not apt. There is no research question or hypothesis to give direction to the study. Many explanations are required. Author(s) should look at the comment in the body of the work and effect necessary corrections	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
The result was not clear as there was no indication of what was done in the study. It becomes difficult to link the result to what was done. Suggestion had been offered.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
Expected information from the study was not included in the conclusion. Author(s) must give a summary of the problem and the solution as conclusion.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Some of the references were not cited and those that are cited are not referenced. There was no proper method that was followed in the references. Author(s) had been advised to either use APA 6 <sup>th</sup> or 7 <sup>th</sup> edition of referencing.	

**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): Necessary corrections to be effected in the work.**