

Paper: **“Political Dimension of Policy Implementation in Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria”**

Corresponding Author: Dare Arowolo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n11p136

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Danijela Romić

College of Applied Sciences “Lavoslav Ruzicka”, Vukovar, Croatia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.04.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: 19.3.2020. | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Political Dimension of Policy Implementation in Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0406/20 | |
| 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>The title clearly emphasizes what the purpose and theme of the paper is</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| <i>The abstract clearly indicates the topic of the research, what methods were used and what are the results of the research</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| <i>I didn't find any grammatical or spelling mistakes</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Study methods, selection of participants and research techniques are clearly explained</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>The body of the paper contains all necessary elements, clearly describes the context, theoretical framework, research and results</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>The conclusion contains description of the problem, methods used, conclusion and recommendations for improvements</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | |
| <i>More than 60 relevant books and articles by respected authors from around the world are cited in the references</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:

