

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:
Date Manuscript Received: October 26, 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: October 26, 2017
Manuscript Title: INSURGENCY AND THE SHRINKING SPACE FOR GIRL-CHILD EDUCATION IN THE NORTH-EAST, NIGERIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1135/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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 very clear and represents the content of the paper. However, in the title, as well as in the abstract and throughout the paper I would change the term "girl-child" to "young girl" or to "juvenile girl," perhaps "female juvenile," even though I have noticed that writers who analyze African society do tend to use the term.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Indeed the abstract summarizes things neatly.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>To the best of my knowledge the English is perfectly well.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>It is not clear whether the field study was made by the writer of this paper or if he is just quoting. It is OK to quote, but it should be written plainly. If, on the other hand, there is genuine data – it should be brought about in the form of a table.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Most of the writing relies on secondary sources, which is legitimate.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Indeed, the conclusion relies on the sub-chapters that compose the article and summarizes things properly.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>I would differ between primary sources [news reports, newspapers] and secondary sources [academic books and papers from journals], and put them in two separate sub-lists. I would also add secondary sources to almost each of the large topics [like education, girl's education, etc.] that are mentioned in the article.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Just a small effort and the paper is perfectly suitable for publication. Follow my comments, fix the reference list and enrich it a little, and you have a wonderful article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: