Paper: **"The Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in Newsrooms in Kenya: a Multi-case Study"**

Corresponding Author: Paul Kimweli

Peer review:

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **THE ADOPTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN NEWSROOMS IN KENYA: A MULTI – CASE STUDY**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No (no)	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A brilliant manuscript that fits into contemporary issues in news gathering and processing; particularly in developing countries.

Correct some grammatical errors such as: what are the factors that drive/hinder(s) …. (abstract)
The tremendous advancement in communication technologies and integration of artificial intelligence in recent years have (has)
Further, Munoriyarwa et al. posits (posit) that the three levels are (P.2)
The authors have to decide whether to use 'researchers' or researcher. There is need for consistency; but since many authors are involved, I recommend 'researchers'.

Introductory part of Findings and Discussions segment should be move to methodology segment in order to strengthen it.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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. Martina Mutheu	
University/Country: University of Nairobi Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/06/2022
Manuscript Title: **THE ADOPTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN NEWSROOMS IN KENYA: A MULTI – CASE STUDY**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0633/22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
It's clear and adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is adequate though lengthy. While it can suffice as it is, summarizing it further by leaving details to the body is advisable	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The paper is well written	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The study methodology is clear however the authors need to avoid the definition of terms and justification of use of some of the chosen methods. These include qualitative research approach, descriptive research case study among others. They should state the various processes they used and leave the explanation to the main research document which readers can find through links to the entire document. The details of the sampling procedure should also not include the entire process but the final number	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are well articulated as captured from subjects. Further analysis is relevant to the findings	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion is adequate and speaks to the status of adoption in the area of study. Conclusions and recommendations are drawn from findings and resonate with the possible direction of improvement	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The authors need to use recommended referencing within the text to avoid hypertext links. The reference list is inclusive	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	**x**
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper contributes significant knowledge in the field of Journalism. The introduction is sufficient in contextualizing the reader, findings and recommendations are relevant and appropriate. However, the abstract and methodology sections can be shortened by eliminating details.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
The paper is well presented and contributes significant knowledge in the field and can be published as it is though it can be better if comments to the authors are incorporated