



Paper: “An Evaluation of the use of Igbo Language for Communication Among Residents of South-East Nigeria”

Corresponding Author: Okechukwu Chukwuma

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p172

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Julius Omokhunu
University of Lagos, Nigeria

Reviewer 1: Idogun Olasunkanmi
University of Lagos, Nigeria

Reviewer 1: Alawode, Sunday Olayinka
Lagos State University, Lagos, Nigeria

Published: 31.08.2020

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: Idogun Olasunkanmi	
University/Country: University of Lagos	
Date Manuscript Received: 4 th of August	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 th of August
Manuscript Title: THE USE OF IGBO AS LANGUAGE OF COMMUNICATION AMONG RESIDENTS OF SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 47.08.2020	
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.	3
<p><i>If the major concern of the researcher is that the Igbo language is predicted to go into extinction, as stated in the statement of the research problem, then the topic needs restructuring.</i></p> <p><i>Although, the topic is very simple and straight forward but it lacks empirical construction.</i></p> <p><i>The Igbos are predominantly located in the South East Nigeria and their language of communication is IGBO. However, investigating the use of their predominant</i></p>	

<p><i>language among the IGBO people in their predominant place of habitation is unempirical, hence, that fault the empirical construction of the topic.</i></p> <p><i>For example...</i></p> <p><i>THE IMPORTANCE OF USING THE IGBO LANGUAGE AS A CONSTANT LANGUAGE OF COMMUNICATION AMONG THE IGBO CITIZENS</i></p> <p><i>THE PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE USE OF IGBO LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AMONG THE RESIDENT OF SOUTH-EASTERN NIGERIA</i></p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>The researcher ought to specify the Local Governments selected, which he/she considered a treat area to the use of Igbo language as a language of communication. That place shouldn't be silences; it is the core part of the research that constitutes the very essence of the study.</i></p> <p><i>The researcher should also, explain the method he/she adopted in distributing the questionnaire. YES, he used Taro Yamane's sample determinism formula, but how did he share the number over the selected local governments and where were 2 responses missing?</i></p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

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: DR ALAWODE, Sunday Olayinka	Email:
University/Country: Lagos State University, Lagos, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 4/8/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/8/2020
Manuscript Title: THE USE OF IGBOAS LANGUAGE OF COMMUNICATION AMONG RESIDENTS OF SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Title is appropriate to the content</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Succinct but lacking key words and word count</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments) A lot of errors but deriving from digital transfers</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Methods not detailed enough particularly the sampling procedures</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) needed some clarifications</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) fair</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<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):

Study good, but too simple suggesting undergraduate work not properly upgraded for academic journal publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Paper simple but good.

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: Julius Omokhunu	
University/Country: University of Lagos, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The Use Of Igbo As Language Of Communication Among Residents Of South-East Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0847/20	
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.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Another round of proofreading is advised to eliminate infrequent occurrences of unnecessary grammatical repetitions such as “famously known”. Punctuations (commas, full stops and semi-colons) need to be given a closer look to allow the message to flow (especially in the introduction). Consistency in capitalization and spelling (US/UK) should be maintained e.g. colonial masters/Colonial Masters and colonization/colonization.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The researcher(s) mentioned so-called “threat-areas” as the physical locations from which respondents were selected. What are these threat areas and what makes them threatened? What studies support this assertion?</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>While the researcher(s) adequately related the conclusion and summary to the preceding content, it is unclear how they concluded that “Most of the respondents could not make a complete statement in Igbo language without code-switching or code-mixing with the English language”. The quoted statement would suggest that another method beyond the questionnaire (interview, focus group or observation, perhaps) was deployed. However, the methodology or the data presentation does not give evidence of the process that yielded the cited conclusion. The researchers should either indicate the methodology that led to the conclusion or rephrase the statement to properly reflect their intention.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>It appears one citation is not referenced – Agbo & Chukwuma (2017).</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):

The paper is precise, authoritative, and succinct. Please pay particular attention to the comments on the methods and conclusions to further improve the quality of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: