

**Paper: “Coverage of Science, Technology, and Innovation by Major Broadcast Networks in Nigeria: an Exploratory Survey”**

**Submitted: 30 May 2022**

**Accepted: 08 July 2022**

**Published: 31 July 2022**

Corresponding Author: Charles Obot

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p119](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p119)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antonio Solís Lima  
Tecnológico Nacional de México, México

Reviewer 2: Nicholas Iwokwagh  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Abdullahi S. Bashir  
Modibbo Adama University, Yola

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Prof. Nicholas Iwokwagh	
University/Country: Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 16 <sup>th</sup> June 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2022
Manuscript Title: Coverage of Science, Technology, and Innovation by Select Broadcast Stations in Nigeria: An Exploratory Survey	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0615/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No (Yes)	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No (Yes)	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No (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>(The title is clear, appropriate, and adequate to the content of this paper because it reflects the key concepts and thematic issues that were discussed in the paper).</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The abstract gives a clear, lucid, and concise presentation of the objects, methods, and results. It is a terse rendition of the pertinent issues that have been discussed in detail in the introduction, body, conclusion, and recommendations of the paper)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(There are a few grammatical errors and a few omissions. However, these are minimal, and have not in any way compromised the quality of the paper)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The study methods are explained clearly, however, the first paragraph in the methods segment is not necessary, because it carries extraneous material. So, I would advise that the authors should expunge it)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The results are clear, because the explanation building technique was used to analyse the data, which is qualitative in nature and to draw inferences and conclusions)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content. They also support available literature as indicated in the literature review)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The references are appropriate and comprehensive. In addition, the references are current and up to date, with few having publication dates of 2021, and 2022, therefore they reflect the current viewpoints, insights, and perspectives)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Delete the first paragraph in the methods segment because it carries extraneous material.

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

The authors of this paper did a great job; however, minor revision is required. The editors should ensure that the authors delete the first paragraph in the methods segment.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022***

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 Abdullahi S. Bashir	
University/Country: Modibbo Adama University, Yola	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Coverage of Science, Technology and Innovation by Select Broadcast Stations in Nigeria: An Exploratory Survey	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 15.06.22	
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>
<i>The topic need to be tinkered with a little to: Coverage of science, technology and innovation by major broadcast networks in Nigeria: An exploratory survey</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Rewrite the first sentence of the abstract. Provide a background statement/sentence(s) and add the rationale for the study. State the major findings in positives and avoid vague expression like 'show greater commitment'. I am not sure of the journal's style but the reporting should be in present tense. E.g. the study 'is aimed at', not 'was aimed at'. In the abstract, the reader should be able to get general picture; not NTA has this, FRCN has that and AIT does not. One of the keywords, 'Qualitative research' should be removed because the study isn't qualitative.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are few grammatical errors.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The studies design and sample selection are not explained and rationalized. The interview schedule is not described and not explanation as to how it was administered. As the interview were transcribed, it should be part of the meta-data to accompany this manuscript. In some parts of the paper, is said to be qualitative but in the method section it used structured interview (p.11) which is a quantitative instrument. So, there is ambiguity that need to be addressed.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The first research questions need to be rearranged in such a way as to focus on the broadcast media, not scientific community. Three theories were used to anchor the study (Diffusion of Innovations, Agenda Setting and Framing) but actually how they were deployed is not visible in the work. Seems more or less like anecdotal. Especially, the latter, should be removed altogether. On the perception by the select broadcast media of the contributions of Nigeria's STI engagements to specific areas of national development, the result should be discussed distinctive, not just a replay of table 2.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The conclusion is centering on 'scientific agencies' while the study is about the broadcast media.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Entman 1993; Heiba 2011; not listed in reference. AIT (2022), NTA (2022) and FRCN (2022) not cited in text but listed in reference.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reject	
--------	--

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

1. Is the study about coverage of scientific public agencies or all the research community in the country? Or is there no private research community? This has to be clarified. The concept of STIs need to be conceptualized and contextualized based on Nigerian situation/environment.
2. The introduction part need to be beefed up. The reader will need to know about Nigeria and the media environment.
3. Objective number one should focus on the media which is the subject of this study, not the scientific community.
4. Profiles of the three broadcast stations should be moved to the method section and only functional information be provided. Too much focus on history and laws is not relevant here. Focus should be on current structure, distribution, types of programming, staffing, market share and/or audience, etc.
5. No need to operationally define communication. 'National development' and 'coverage' can discussed in the background as well.
6. This study as presented is structured and quantitative, remove the mention of qualitative research
7. There is weak literature review and the absence of local scholarship related to the topic. Please Review literature on the coverage of STIs in Nigeria including Gidado, Isah and Iweajunwa (2022); Batta, Ashong and Obot (2014); Omeje 2019; Falade, Batta and Onifade, 2020; Moyo, 1996; and others

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

The manuscript evaluation form is not robust. It should have sections evaluating the empirical grounding, conceptualization/conceptual modelling, explanatory logic, quality of communication esp for international audience (not just grammatical errors and spelling mistakes), etc.

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Antonio Solís Lima	
University/Country: Tecnológico Nacional de México/México	
Date Manuscript Received: 16-06-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22-06-2022
Manuscript Title: Coverage of Science, Technology and Innovation by Select Broadcast Stations in Nigeria: An Exploratory Survey	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0615/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> /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>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The study method is not complete, because it is necessary the interview questions must be evaluated by experts before its application. And this task is not mentioned in the manuscript.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
The conclusions are not supported accurately, because there is not a chief question that leds the research.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
References must be ordered alphabetically, and all of them must be cited in the manuscript	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

It is advisable to define only one research question that leads the investigation.  
It is recommendable that in the literature review section, most of the support statements of the research must have a citation.  
Regarding to the methodology, it is advisable to describe it fully. In this case, it is lacking the validation of the questions of the interview by an expert team.  
References must be ordered alphabetically.

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

It is recommendable that this job must not be published until the authors had attended the remarks that were done to the attached manuscript.

