Paper: **"English Language, Globalisation and the Future of the Nigerian Indigenous Languages"**

Corresponding Author: Eucharia Okwudilichukwu Ugwu

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Nino Kemertelidze
Georgian Technical University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Maria Del Carmen Hernandez Cueto
Universidad Autonoma De Nayarit, Mexico

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Published: 31.05.2020

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!

Reviewer Name: Nino Kemertelidze	Email:
University/Country: Georgian Technical University / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 4.05.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 6.05.2020
Manuscript Title: English Language, Globalisation and the Future of the Nigerian Indigenous Languages	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is clear enough and quite impressive. The problem is really crucial and rather burning. It is a well-known fact that there are over 500 native languages spoken in Nigeria though, the official language of Nigeria is English. In addition to English, Hausa, Yoruba, Igbo, Fula, and English Creole are widely spoken. Many of the languages exist in written form. It is hard to imagine the modern world without the English language. The dominance of the English language in Nigeria has relegated the use of the indigenous languages.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**

The abstract of the presented paper complies with the set requirements. It briefly but quite explicitly conveys the content of the paper. The abstract ends with the following sentence: "This paper discusses the current precarious situation of the Nigerian indigenous languages, especially the minority ones in the face of globalization, the domineering effect of English language and what can be done to make these languages withstand the test of time". The last phrase "…. what can be done to make these languages withstand the test of time" is rather intriguing and definitely attracts a reader's interest in the paper.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**

No grammatical error. The language of the paper is rather impressive. Vocabulary is rich enough.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**

Very good. The episode where we find out about the method (it is given in the section 3) is written though briefly, but meticulously what is highlighted in the Table 1 given after the section "Recommendations and Conclusion".

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**

The architectonics of the paper is good enough. Each section is entitled and logically linked with another. The introduction, like the abstract, is intriguing as its last sentence" Some suggestions on how to reverse the current trend were made for the survival of the minority languages so that they will not go into extinction in the near future" keeps the reader in constant interest to read the paper quickly to find out how it would be possible to survive at least the minority languages. The introduction is followed by the section "The Nigerian Linguistic Situation" where the author speaks about different languages in Nigerian and shows historical background. The next section is "The Situation of the Nigerian Languages" where the author speaks about the domination of the English language, how many languages are endangered and the reasons of endangerment. In the same section the author discusses in details four relatively high/low degrees of functional load established by Pandharipande what is very interesting. This section is followed by a very interesting section "Language Shift in Nigeria: A Major Concern" which is logically linked with the previous ones. Finally, we come across conclusion and a long list of references.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content, but what makes it especially valuable is the fact that is includes the recommendations what actions could be taken to remain the languages discussed in the paper relevant now and in the future.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**

The bibliography is really rich enough. It comprises contemporary researches. It includes 24 references what is quite an acceptable number for an article. The references are listed in alphabetic order.

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):

Rather impressive paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Rather impressive paper.

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: MARIA DEL CARMEN HERNANDEZ CUETO	
University/Country:UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA DE NAYARIT	
Date Manuscript Received:May 4, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 12,2020
Manuscript Title: English Language, Globalisation and the Future of the Nigerian Indigenous Languages	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0556/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**	
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: **Ye**s	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)It would be better "Globalisation and the Future of the *Nigerian Indigenous Languages"*	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
(Please insert your comments)The abstract does not present objects, neither methods or results. It only introduces the reader the topic with a general overview.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
(Please insert your comments) **Few grammatical mistakes**	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
(Please insert your comments)None method is explained	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
(Please insert your comments)The body is not completed because it states the situation of Indigenous languages, but it doesn't explain background of languages and the real situation, how many languages, what languages, where are spoken, how many people speak those languages?	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
(Please insert your comments)	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
(Please insert your comments)Some of the references are not appropriated cited	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The Author did not follow the guide to publish article in European Journal, somebody has to help to order information, make clear what kind of method is the person using and what is the objective to have that method to study the object.