

Paper: “Coverage and Framing of Emerging STI and STEM by Four Major Nigerian Newspapers and Implications for National Development”

Submitted: 31 August 2022

Accepted: 30 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Herbert Effiong Batta

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p116](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p116)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nicholas Iwokwagh
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Vladutescu Stefan
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 3: Kimweli Paul
Aga Khan University, Kenya

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: 17/9/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/9/22
Manuscript Title: Coverage and Framing of Emerging STI and STEM by four major Nigerian Newspapers and Implications for National Development	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0945/22	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article. It captures the whole essence and kernel of the article.)</i>	

2. The Paper presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(The objectives, methods and results of the paper are presented in a clear, concise and comprehensive manne.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(There is only one grammatical error in this article, and no spelling mistake)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(The study method – Content Analysis is explained clearly)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(The results are not only clearly reported, but also skillfully interpreted and inferences logically drawn)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The conclusions are accurate, logical and supported by the content)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(The references are comprehensive and appropriate)</i>	

s

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):

Always put in brackets, percentages used within the text. It is imperative to use **ampersand** instead of **and** within the brackets that are intended to list more than one author.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Ensure that the suggested corrections are effected.

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: Stefan Vladutescu			
University/Country: University of Craiova/ Romania			
Date Manuscript Received:	16.09.2022	Date Review Report Submitted:	02.10.2022
Manuscript Title: Coverage and Framing of Emerging STI and STEM by Four Major Nigerian Newspapers and Implicationsfor National Development			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.45.09.2022			
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title of the manuscript reflects its content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The abstract correctly retains the objective, theme, method of investigation and research results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>It would be good for the manuscript to be read by a native English speaker.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method used is appropriate to the topic approached.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are relevant.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions of the manuscript are based on the investigation carried out.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>It is necessary to update the bibliography with relevant works from 2022.</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):

This manuscript needs to be completed with a "Future research" section.
It is necessary to update the bibliography with relevant works from 2022.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This manuscript needs to be completed with a "Future research" section.
It is necessary to update the bibliography with relevant works from 2022.

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: Paul Kimweli	
University/Country: Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/10/2022
Manuscript Title: Coverage and Framing of Emerging STI and STEM by Four Major Nigerian Newspapers and Implications for National Development	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0945/22	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The authors should check on sentence construction and punctuations.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The researchers should clearly demonstrate what approach, design, research methods, data generation tools they adopted for this study.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Under research methods, the researchers mentioned to capture qualitative and quantitative aspect of the study investigation. Reading through the findings, I got a feeling that the results are more quantitative. My concern is, how was qualitative aspect of the study captured in the findings?</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The lack of qualitative aspect in the results would warrant revising.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There are some reference lists that are not captured within APA style of referencing and citations</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):

1. First this is a commendable investigation. However, the researchers should revise on their in-text citations. Even if you adopt the 6th or 7th edition, quite a number of the citations should be revised.
2. On results – reading through your study, I did not feel the qualitative aspect of the study was substantiated in the findings/results. A revision on that should be necessary.
3. Sentence construction – some of the sentences are too long. I do suggest you get an editor to help.