



Paper: “Regionalization of Non-State Security Agencies in Southwest Nigeria: Prospects and Challenges of “Amotekun””

Corresponding Author: Ayotunde David Odewale

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n20p103

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Cavens Kithinji
Pan Africa Christian University; Nairobi Kenya

Reviewer 3: Robert Cobb Jr
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, USA

Published: 31.07.2020

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: Robert Cobb Jr	Email:
University/Country: North Carolina A&T State University	
Date Manuscript Received: May 15, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 19, 2020
Manuscript Title: Regionalization of Non-State Security Agencies in Southwest Nigeria: Prospects and Challenges of “Amotekun”	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 119.02.2020	
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>The title of the manuscript is consistent with the content being presented.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>The abstract adequately surmises what is being articulated in the document</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Please refer to document with Track Changes on. There are minimal edits to consider</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>This paper did not present neither research questions, data collection, data analysis, nor methodology. It was written as concept paper to initiate awareness or discussion</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Please refer to document with Track Changes. There are minimal modifications to consider.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Please see the attached document with Track Changes for suggested edits

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Please see the attached document with Track Changes for suggested edits