EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Statistical Analysis of the Dissemination of Cultural Heritage in Traditional and Social Media in Burundi "**

Submitted: 23 February 2024
Accepted: 04 April 2025
Published: 30 April 2025

Corresponding Author: Remy Nsavyimana

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n11p56

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Brian Sloboda
University of Maryland, USA

Reviewer 2: Stefan Vladutescu
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title of the manuscript reflects its content.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract correctly retains the objective, theme, method of investigation and research results.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
It would be good for the manuscript to be read by a native English speaker.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The method used is appropriate to the topic approached.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The results are relevant.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusions of the manuscript are based on the investigation carried out.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
It is necessary to update the bibliography with 2-4 relevant works from 2023, 2024, 2025.
References sto in 2022!
It is required that these references be from the area of Africa, Europe, USA, etc., because the bibliography used seems to be from a single area. ESJ has permeability all over the world.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

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 2-4 relevant works from 2023, 2024, 2025.
It is required that these references be from the area of Africa, Europe, USA, etc., because the bibliography used seems to be from a single area. ESJ has permeability all over the world.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title of this paper is clear. No changes are required for the title
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract of this paper is clear. No changes are required for the title
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Yes, The authors should consider having a colleague or a professional editor review this paper. This will help the flow of this paper
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes these methods are explained clearly
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
No, The authors should consider having a colleague or a professional editor review this paper. This will help the flow of this paper
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The Conclusion is rather confusing in this paper. The information regarding Conflict of Interest etc. should be on a separate page. It seems like it is part of the conclusion
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Yes.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Here are the comments on the paper "Statistical analysis of the dissemination of cultural heritage in traditional and social media in Burundi," submitted to European Scientific Journal.

1. The literature review should be written in past tense as the work has already been completed, similar to this paper's methods and empirical results.

2. At the end of the Review of the Literature section, the author(s) should have a brief paragraph of a few sentences that summarizes the literature that they presented in their paper.

3. For the keywords, be sure to have at least 5 keywords. Also put a comma after each keyword. Keyword should Keywords.

4. In the Abstract, in the first sentence, "The objective of this work....." should be rewritten as "The objective of this paper.

5. Doctoral school of the University of Burundi should be Doctoral School of the University of Burundi
6. Unesco should be UNESCO. Be sure to correct this throughout the paper.

7. II Material and methods should be Material and Methods

8. You should write all academic papers in third person. This means avoiding pronouns like I, me, you, your, our, ours, us and we since these pronouns reflect either first person plural or second person.

9.The first row in Table 1 is hard to read. Please make it more readable. Most tables are like this. Please make them readable.

10. On page 3 this figure is hard to read. Also what is the number for this figure?

11. Capitalize every letter of the title of each section and subsection in the paper.

12. Use of the word “will” is distracting and not appropriate for work that has already been done.

13. The sentence "As Howard (2005) A Handbook of Reporting "The Mission....> This is a confusing sentence. The authors should rewrite it.

14. In the table that used CNC Report the authors should say "Data compiled from the CNC Report..."

15. Table 4, total should be Total

16. Table 5 has a blank column. This should be removed

17. In figure 5, there is a fourth color in the legend. However it does not show in the graph.

18. In the sentence after Figure 5, " As the table above shows... should be rewritten as Figure 5 showed..."

19. Should Twitter be X since the name was changed a few years ago?

20. In many of the figures the vertical column do not have commas. It is hard to read these numbers.

21. Be sure in the tables that Facebook, Twitter Youtube are capitalized. There is a mixture throughout the tables

22. In the sentence "Some radio stations even exceed the editorial lines... what does this sentence mean? Not clear

23. In table 8, Burundi Pride Journal is Facebook?

24. In all of the tables be sure to use commas. The number are hard to read.

25. In the sentence "The newspaper visited by a few internet users is Burundi Pride." How does this sentence tie into the previous sentence?

26. Under the Conclusion "The Value of these work..." Needs to be rewritten. Also word should be works.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is appropriate to the content of the article.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract clearly states the purpose, the methodology involving analysis of metadata from CNC and ASCM, the specific number of radio stations and items analyzed, and distinctly summarizes the results, highlighting the limited presence of cultural heritage in media content.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
There are minor inconsistencies, such as the numbering of tables and figures (e.g., Figure 5 is mentioned multiple times with different content).
This should be corrected for clarity.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methodology used for the analysis is presented clearly, citing the sources (CNC and ASCM), clearly outlining the number of radio and TV stations involved, and the specific number of programs analyzed.
The methods are transparent, enabling replicability.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is logically structured and clear. Tables and data are adequately explained, and the analysis effectively supports the research objectives.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion accurately reflects the paper's findings, clearly reiterating the low representation of cultural heritage in media coverage. It also aligns with the main data and analysis provided throughout the paper.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The references cited are comprehensive and suitable for the study.
The referencing style should be made consistent, adhering strictly to a recognized referencing format (APA or Chicago), as some inconsistencies are noticeable.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Briefly expand the abstract and conclusion sections for greater clarity and relevance to the implications of the study.
Clearly renumber and align all tables and figures.
