



Paper: “Conflict in Cross Border Higher Education: Franchised Cross Border Ethiopian Universities in Somaliland Higher Education”

Corresponding Author: Rawling Wondemneh

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p143

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Jelena Zascerinska
University of Latvia, Latvia

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: Dr. Jelena Zascerinska	Email:
University/Country: Centre for Education and Innovation Research, Latvia	
Date Manuscript Received: 17 June 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 June 2020
Manuscript Title: Crossing Border and Fronting Conflicts: Franchised Cross Border Ethiopian Universities Learning-Teaching in Somaliland Higher Education	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 106.06.2020	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> The first part of the title could be omitted as it does not obviously refer to the educational field	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The abstract clearly presents objects and methods. The results are not described in detail.</p> <p>Abbreviation FGD could be explained in the abstract.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>Use of scientific language is ok. English should be re-checked through the paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 3: developed countries of border crossing or border crossing or developed countries? - Page 3: researches conducted or researches were conducted? - Page 5: 2.2.1 Meaning of Franchising Mode and, conflict: why is a comma used? - Page 8: numbers under 10 are written in words. - Page 10: data was or data were?,etc 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The study methods are explained. The table is useful for understanding of the sample composition and data analysis.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The body of the paper is logical and well-structured.</p> <p>Page 4: "...election is much better than Somalia..." - a citation is required as it is not clear why the author(s) make(s) a conclusion that "...election is much better than..."</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>The conclusions are accurate and drawn on the basis of the data analysis. Theresearcher formulated a tangible asset for the recently emerged Somaliland NationalCommission for Higher Education.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p><i>The proposal is to avoid the citation of the secondary source (for example, MoEYS (1996) cited on (Bekalo, Brophy, & Welford, 2003)and to cite only the first source (for example, Bekalo, Brophy, & Welford, 2003).</i></p> <p><i>Merriam Webster is cited on Page 5, but the list of references does not contain the cited source.</i></p> <p><i>The list of references contains 2 different works of Andrew Terry (1996): which is cited and when? Researchers use such a system: Terry 2016a and 2016b.</i></p>	

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):

Thank you for the interesting paper! The topic is relevant and requires further research efforts.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No extra comments