

Paper: “Online Audiences and Gatekeeping: User Comments and Their Influence on Editorial Processes in Newsrooms in Kenya”

Submitted: 24 March 2023

Accepted: 09 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

Corresponding Author: Kimweli Paul

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p105](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p105)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Orungbeja, Babatunde
Babcock University, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Samuel Maxwell Tom Williams
Njala University, Sierra Leone

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Babatunde Orungbeja	
University/Country: Babcock University. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: May 10, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: May 15, 2023
Manuscript Title: ONLINE AUDIENCES AND GATEKEEPING: USER COMMENTS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON EDITORIAL PROCESSES IN NEWSROOMS IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0417/23	
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>There is no ambiguity in the title in relation to the article's content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The objectives, methods of investigation and research result are well presented in the abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The length of the paragraphs atimes impact negatively on the punctuations and weaken the message being conveyed. There are occasional usage of informal expressions which are not helpful in academic writing.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>There is a clear depiction of the study methods</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Some of the figures require careful revision.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The content support the summary sufficiently.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are sufficient, even though a couple of them could be updated. These are older than 5 years.</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):

The sentences and paragraphs are a bit lengthy. Kindly use simple sentences for better effect and clearly delimit your paragraphing to not more than 10 lines per paragraph.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The references can be updated with relevant studies conducted between 2017 and 2022.

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: 16 th May 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 rd May 23, 2023
Manuscript Title: ONLINE AUDIENCES AND GATEKEEPING: USER COMMENTS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON EDITORIAL PROCESSES IN NEWSROOMS IN KENYA	
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.

<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>(Yes, the topic is well placed, it captured the context of the research)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(The abstract is explicitly elaborated with an alignment in the objectives, methodologies and results)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Minor grammatical errors are sensed within the manuscript</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>*The Methods seems too long to me; it should be focused.</i></p> <p><i>*The Qualitative data or focus group discussions (FGDs) were described as one of the methods for data collection: - It is unclear how such FGDs were held, how many with how many respondents in each FGD.</i></p> <p><i>However, the used of thematic analysis techniques to analyze qualitative data is appreciable.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p><i>Yes.</i></p> <p><i>However, it was observed that the percentage distribution in some tables were in whole numbers (Table: 2, 3 and 4) while others are in one decimal place value (table: 5, 6, 7 & 8). So I suggest you set the % values in a decimal place values.</i></p> <p><i>I don't think it is ideal to start a sentence with a numeral. So most of the sentences that started with a number should be rephrased or you spell out the numbers.</i></p> <p><i>Check this:</i></p> <p>79% - interested in engaging with productive ...</p> <p>89% - political, sensational ...</p> <p>56.3% of journalists have participated in correcting misinformation.</p> <p><i>These figures are not consistent with what is in table 7.</i></p> <p><i>Like;</i> Majority of the respondents noted that they engage with User Comments daily (46%) followed by those who do so two to three times a week (24%) while only 9% have never interacted with online user comments.</p> <p><i>This sentence is not clear,</i></p> <p>How much do journalists use the comment sections to generate new story ideas (70%), improve the story or reedit (66%), pulldown (75%) and correction (78%). 56.3% of journalists have participated in correcting misinformation.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes; the conclusions that user comments on news websites can be generally categorized as engaging in nature where members of the public are looking to lend their voice to ongoing discussions online.</i>	

<i>However, the conclusions are also too long. They should be more focused</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Yes; but have you however referenced this citation?</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wang (2000) notes that a 	

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):

- Have you named a corresponding author?
- Should your abstract have subheadings? Many journals have strict requirements with regards to abstract structure.
- Have you included a data statement section? Many journals and funder require authors to make their raw data available by publishing it in a repository. * You should explain where your data is and how others can access it. * Most repositories will make your data citable and give it a unique identifier. You should include the identifier in this section and put the citation in your references list. The Digital Curation Centre has lots of good advice on how to curate and share your data. www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/how-guides/cite-datasets
- Have you said which Ethical Review Board gave you ethical approval?
- Have you included an acknowledgements section? You should mention anybody that significantly contributed to the study but doesn't meet the four criteria for authorship. www.aje.com/en/arc/editing-tip-writing-acknowledgments/
- Have you included a conflicts of interests section?
- Have you included a section called "Funding"?

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- There are some typographical errors and missing words etc. in the presentation of the findings:
- Therefore the manuscript requires editing

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: ONLINE AUDIENCES AND GATEKEEPING: USER COMMENTS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON EDITORIAL PROCESSES IN NEWSROOMS IN KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0417/23	
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 No	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Good though it can be made shorter	

In name section, why use of title Prof? No need of titles like Mr., Ms., Dr. Prof in a paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) The abstract captures the entire work from the objectives to methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The grammar is good	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study method is well detailed and clearly explained	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Report data by rounding off instead of 35.7% have around 36%; 21.43% about 21%	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Give a more precise recommendation for implementation	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Reference are comprehensive and include most recent articles</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):

Rework the results section. No need of restating figures in the table. The response rate data should be presented in a table.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Publish with minor corrections