



**Manuscript: “Illegal Oil Bunkering in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: A Challenge to Nigeria’s Development”**

**Submitted: 15 April 2020**

**Accepted: 28 September 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Tombari Bodo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p134](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p134)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** G.T. Akwen  
Federal University Gashua, Nigeria

**Reviewer 2:** Julius Iyorakpo  
National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria

# ***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!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 4 <sup>th</sup> June, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2020
Manuscript Title: Illegal Oil Bunkering in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: Environmental Challenges and Solutions	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0493/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The Title should be retained as it is adequate and suitable for the Article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Abstract should briefly introduce the Topic, Population Sample of Actors, the Variables (various ways environmental challenges are impacted on the region) and procedural approach to the study/findings.</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Some spelling mistakes and grammatical errors were observed. This could be attributable to typographic on one hand and that of the Author on the other hand. Author should proofread thoroughly before publication.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The Study method is not clearly stated. This should be succinctly stated to give a clear direction of the procedure applied in the Study.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The body of the Paper is clear with minimal errors mostly typographical that need to be corrected.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>This should be a brief combination of summary of the Findings and the Conclusion together or separately including recommendation where necessary.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Author should stick to the referencing. This should conform to the International Journals style or the APA form. After the Author's Surname, the other names should be in abbreviation.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Authors are advice to make necessary corrections and proofreading before publication.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***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!***

Reviewer Name: G.T. Akwen	Email:
University/Country: Federal University Gashua/ Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: June 6, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: June 7, 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>ILLEGAL OIL BUNKERING IN THE NIGER DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA: ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="color: green;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <span style="color: green;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <span style="color: green;">Yes</span> /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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
In the body of the paper, there are other challenges apart from the ones prosed to the environment I suggest: “Illegal oil bunkering in the Niger Delta Region: A challenge to Nigeria’s Development”	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>results.</b>	
There is a need to include: the main argument of the paper, methodology, theoretical framework, some major findings in the abstract	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The language presentation is clear and adequate, but there is need for shallow language editing.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>There is a need to discuss study methods. This aspect is not included in the paper. Since it is a review paper, the methods can be discussed in the introduction</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
I suggest the body of the paper be restructured for the logical flow of the arguments. For instance, after the introduction, the next section should be ‘Conceptual clarification, which should include the Niger Delta region and development (only if we agree with the suggestion made about the topic). The third part of the paper should be a theoretical framework. The system theory by David Easton can theoretically capture the reality of this paper. The causes of illegal oil bunkering should constitute the 4 <sup>th</sup> section of the paper and should be followed by the presumed benefits of illegal oil bunkering, consequences of illegal oil bunkering, solution and conclusion.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Okay</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
The references are not arranged in alphabetical order. There is also inconsistency in the style. The writers should check the style recommended by the ESJ.	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):** This is a contemporary problem with a long history. Your efforts towards tackling the problem are commendable. However, I would suggest we seek for a local solution to this problem based on our peculiar circumstances. If people without formal education can refine crude into several products, they need to be encouraged.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**