



Paper: “Administrative Roles in Primary Schools for Curbing COVID-19 Pandemic in Nigeria: Henry Fayol’s Approach”

Corresponding Author: Innocent C. Igbokwe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p63

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelfettah Maouni
Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Iresha Lakshman
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 30.06.2020

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:	Email:
University/Country: American	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.05.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.05.2020
Manuscript Title: Administrative Roles of Headteachers And Classroom Teachers in Primary Schools for Curbing Covid-19 Pandemic in Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 96/05.2020	
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.	4
<i>The title does matches with the content of the article. No further changes are needed at the current stage.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract contains the objectives of the study however the methodology and the</i>	

<i>results are left unanswered. The author(s) need to clearly explain the methodology used and what were the results of the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The article is thoroughly proofread and there is no spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>This methodology clearly is the main weakness of the article. There is no empirical data, or any sort of theoretical framework presented. It is understandable that the topic is very recent however we have seen many examples of COVID-19 related articles recently having robust methodology and data. Therefore, the author(s) need to work on the methodology part.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The body of the paper is weak in terms of literature review, issues mentioned, comparative analysis etc. It lacks in-depth analysis and does not base its content to any data.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions are very brief, needs to be elaborated in aligned with the content. Recommendations are not enough to support the issues mentioned in the article.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Considering the recency of the topic, the references are up to date. However again, the author(s) should use more recent sources when talking about COVID-19 as there are many articles published in 2020.</i>	

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):

Kindly define your methodology, importance of the study and provide evidences of data collection. All the best of luck and looking for the revised article.

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: Iresha M. Lakshman	
University/Country: University of Colombo, Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 16.06.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.06.2020
Manuscript Title: Administrative roles of headteachers and classroom teachers in primary schools for curbing covid-19 pandemic in Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0596/20	
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: 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>It contains some grammatical errors and typographical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>No study method discussed as this is not based on any empirical work. However, bit more discussion of Fayol's contribution would have been nice in place of the methodological discussion.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>It contains some grammatical errors and typographical errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Though there is mention of "emulation of their headteachers and classroom teachers" in the conclusion, there wasn't much discussion of the same in the text.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Fayol's work not included in the reference list.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Stick to the term COVID-19 when you discuss the disease and coronavirus when you discuss the virus. These have been used interchangeably and can be confusing since you yourselves have clearly stated the distinction at the beginning of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: None