

Paper: **“Foreign Capital in the Women's Press in Poland in 1989-2019–Attempted Summary”**

Submitted: 08 June 2022

Accepted: 25 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Olga Dąbrowska-Cendrowska

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p41

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Babatunde Ezekiel Olusegun
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 10 th June, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 th June, 2022
Manuscript Title: Women’s press in the Polish media market in 1989-2019–attempted summary	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0631/22	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

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

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):

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: Ezekiel Olusegun Babatunde	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 June, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 June, 2022
Manuscript Title: Women’s press in the Polish media market in 1989-2019 – attempted summary	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title needs to be modified but the crux of the paper is revealed in the body of the paper, hence the need to change the title to reflect what had been done.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The abstract is not detailed enough as it does not show what was the outcome of the evaluation. Author(s) will need to include this in the body of the abstract and show clearly the method adopted to arrive at the results detailed in the body of the work.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The grammar used is fairly alright	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Methods used in the study were not clearly explained. The author is to state explicitly the method used in the body of the work.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results are clear but will need further explanation to justify those that had worked in area before.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The summary was presented but was not properly explained. Author should conclude appropriately.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There is no clear format used and the publisher will have to determine the appropriateness of the way the references was presented. I suggest APA 7th edition be used, there should not be footnote as contained in the body of the work.	

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	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author should remove all the pagination in all the citations. The footnote should also be removed. The title should be revisited and possibly modify in line with what was done. All corrections must be effected as contained in the reviewed manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: