

Paper: “Discourse Strategies in Chief Olusegun Obasanjo’s Letter to President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan”

Submitted: 11 February 2022

Accepted: 22 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: George Adekunle Ojo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p50](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p50)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Luisa Maria Arvide Cambra
Professor, University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 3: Issa Djimet
University of Doba, Chad

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 14 January 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 January 2022
Manuscript Title: DISCOURSE STRATEGIES IN CHIEF OLUSEGUN OBASANJO’S LETTER TO PRESIDENT GOODLUCK EBELE JONATHAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0155/22	
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.

<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>The title is adequate to the content though it does not mention SFL clearly</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>The abstract starts with vague considerations instead of presenting the objects, methods and findings.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The authors do not specify the methods (qualitative or quantitative approach)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Despite the fact that the methodological approach is not clearly specified, the findings are convincing.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are based on findings that have been clearly demonstrated.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Some corrections are needed to comply with APA norms.</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):

Corrections and suggestions are done in-text. Please, accept them or take them into account in order to better the scientific quality of this work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: