Paper: **"Exploring the Components of Digital Identity on Social Networks Sites: Identifier, Post, Profile Photo, and Selfie"**

Corresponding Author: El Yazidi Reda

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Martina Mutheu Mulwa
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Veronica Makena
Pan Africa Christian University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Uchenna Kingsley
 Xiamen University,Siming South Road, Fujian, China

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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:7/12/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/12/2023
Manuscript Title: **Exploring the components of digital identity on social networks sites : identifier, post, profile photo and selfie.**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1234/23	
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 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.	
Yes the topic is suitable to the content of the article though	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	
The abstract does not capture the methods but merely provides literature meant to build the presentation	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The document is well written	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
The study methods are not explained though the author uses content analysis	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
There is great repetition in the paper with the final outcome appearing early in the document	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
The fragmentation of the document as a result of improper paragraphing does not make the ideas flow to a point where conclusions present themselves. Furthermore the author keeps on attempting to define the key concepts	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The references are OK though within the document there are some references that are incomplete re	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Format your document to resemble an journal article and not class notes. Your paper should build an argument that culminates in your final conclusion. Avoid quoting authors without justifying why you are doing it. Your topic is relevant in this era of

social media identity but your arguments are hanging. I don't feel them as what you have done most is to define the identities and quote from others

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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: Exploring the components of digital identity on social networks sites: identifier, post, profile photo and selfie	
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.	**3**

(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.	**3**
(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.	**3**
(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	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The abstract should in clear terms reflect the findings of the study. A thorough proof reading is required. Too space is spent on definitions, this can be compressed and attention given to literature review, research method and what the study will contribute to social network site subscribers; some figures are in Arabic for example, figures 5, 6 and 9, others in English, I suggest the author is consistent. However, since this journal is published in English language, the figures should also be in English language

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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 Veronica Makena	
University/Country: Pan Africa Christian University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 15th December 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 19th Dec 2023
Manuscript Title: Exploring the components of digital identity on social networks sites : identifier, post, profile photo and selfie.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.

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) The content addresses the variables in the title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) The abstract has addressed the objects and methods of the study but the results have not been indicated.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes as highlighted in the attached reviewed document.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The methods are clearly explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The results have been presented scholarly.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The content given supports the conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) There are many references that are not included in the reference list although they are mentioned in the text. A few references are indicated in the reference list but not mentioned in the text. I have indicated this in the attached document. Most of the information lacks the source. This should be included to mitigate on plagiarism.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**25/35 X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There are some changes that the author needs to look into, especially reduction on verbosity and citation. The areas needing attention have been highlighted in the attached document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: