

Manuscript: “**An Analysis of Youth Deradicalization Programs in Northeast Nigeria: A Study on Boko Haram**”

Submitted: 05 February 2021

Accepted: 23 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Mustapha Salihu

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n13p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Wanjiru Nderitu, Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Aguessy Yélian Constant, University of Parakou, Republic of Benin

Reviewer 3: Dr. Jeewaka Saman Kumara, Sri Lanka

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. Wanjiru Nderitu | |
| University/Country: Africa Nazarene University/ Kenya | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 8/02/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 12/02/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: An Assessment of Youth Deradicalization Programs in Northeast Nigeria: A Study on Boko Haram | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 68.02.2021 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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> <i>The topic is more of an analysis of the existing Deradicalization programs as opposed to assessment since there is no statistical proven data on counterfactual groups discussed in the report.</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>The abstract is silent on the methodology used to garner the results; mostly content analysis from diverse literature review. The author may need to revamp this section.</i></p> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>There are few grammatical error in this article. The verbatim response should also be in italics and indented at the center of which is the standard way of reporting qualitative findings.</i></p> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <p><i>(Please insert your comments) The author need to be more explicit here on the methodology implored; who are the target victims precisely?</i></p> <p><i>Although survey-based evidence and theories abounds to suggest that, the adoption of imprisonment and education as deradicalization strategies has produced desired outcomes in Saudi Arabia and Indonesia, the research examines the aforementioned counterinsurgency strategies within the context in which they are implemented. While the Nigerian government has touted the prison program as a viable counterinsurgency strategy on the basis of successfully rehabilitating over 2,000 Boko Haram members in holding, there exists no standard measure for assessing such programs beyond recidivism of deradicalized terrorists.</i></p> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 3 |
| <p><i>(Please insert your comments) was this a desk survey;</i></p> <p><i>“There exists no standard measure for assessing such programs beyond recidivism of deradicalized terrorists” ; not sure if this was part of the study findings. .</i></p> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <p><i>(Please insert your comments) The author may need to explore other conclusive literature to realize accurate conclusions in the context of this study</i></p> <p><i>“Reports from Office of the National Security Adviser (2018) suggest that an ongoing assessment program was put in place, with a view to measuring changes in level of risk. Given the sensitivity of the program, it remains difficult for independent researchers to access the prisoners’ files or the findings of these reports. However, it is still very early days in the program and it will be important to monitor whether prisoners’ initial level stance of defecting is maintained after re-civilization, which could serve as the basis for evaluation and assessment”</i></p> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>Looks comprehensively captured but need to be formatted into ESJ Reference APA</i></p> | |

style format.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | √ |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author may need to venture into other country- based programs that have been tested to address Deradicalization especially amidst the challenges of the interconnected world; globalization. Adhere to ESJ Journal Article Format too. Otherwise the author thrusts out mind- wobbling insights that require a swing to action to curb the devastating radicalization; save youths in Nigeria towards a tenable future.

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.

c

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: AGUESSY Yélian Constant | |
| University/Country: University of Parakou/Republic of Benin | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 08/02/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 15/02/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: An Assessment of Youth Deradicalization Programs in Northeast Nigeria: A Study on Boko Haram | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 68.02.2021 | |
| 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. | 4 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>The title is clear, concise and understandable. However, the author must remove the title that is repeated just above the abstract.</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 2 |
| <p><i>The author must rewrite the abstract by taking into account clearly and rigorously the following requirements of an abstract:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>problem</i> - <i>objective of the study</i> - <i>methodological approach</i> - <i>findings/results</i> - <i>theoretical approach</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 2 |
| <p><i>There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the text. It needs a serious proofreading so as to improve the quality of the paper. The author must also pay attention to his style. His style affects the scientific quality of the paper. For instance, he has to avoid the repetition of some expressions such as (given that, suggest, obtains, evidence abounds to....).He has to avoid the anarchic and whimsical use of punctuation especially 'comma' (,). Check this throughout the text and remove it from where it is not needed.</i></p> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <p><i>This is quite good. However, it can still be improved in order to better the scientific quality of the paper. For example there is absence of adequate theoretical approach which must back up argumentation. (e.g. new historicism, Marxist theory on the class inequalities, post-colonial theory)</i></p> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 2 |
| <p><i>The results are not clearly presented in the paper. They need to be worked on. The author must use some clichés such as: the study has revealed that..., the research has concluded that..., the theoretical approach has shed light on these findings etc. to introduce the results.</i></p> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 2 |
| <p>A conclusion is not another section for argumentation. This part requires specific stages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recall of the problematic - brief summary of the most important ideas dealt with that constitute the | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <p>development of the paper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recall the methodological approach and the results achieved. - Open the debate if necessary. <p>The conclusion must be rewritten in order to reinforce the scientific quality of the document.</p> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <p>This section is quite good. However it needs to be improved. Throughout the paper whenever there is a quote, proceed as follows: (X. Crawford, 1999, p. x), here X represents the initial of the name of Crawford and p. x represents the page where you have withdrawn the quote. Furthermore, he must harmonize the bibliographical entries in the bibliographical references. Things to be taken into account are: the total page of the paper or document consulted e.g. 18p. for a paper or 485p. for a book. The author must write down the date and hours of consultation of internet data. Some of the publication dates are omitted, please consider.</p> | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think that the topic is relevant but you have to pay attention to petty things that make you a good researcher. Be more consistent and you will produce a good paper. Take into account all the observations above and the paper will be published. Take heart!

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. Jeewaka Saman Kumara | |
| University/Country: Sri Lanka | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 13/03/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 21/03/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: An Analysis of Youth Deradicalization Programs in Northeast Nigeria: A Study on Boko Haram | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 68.02.2021 | |
| 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. | 4 |
| The title of present study is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and | 3 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| results. | |
| The objective of this study is not clearly mentioned in the abstract and the methodology in the abstract. Therefore, I hope the author will illustrate both objective and methodology in his abstract in brief. | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| There are some grammatical errors and typing mistakes that can easily be corrected | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| I believe that the author could bring more details on the methodology of the article including data analyzing tools. | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| The body of this paper is clear, still I encountered some grammatical and typing errors | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| The conclusion is good | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| The list of reference need to be rechecked | |

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):

01. Illustrate both objective and methodology in his abstract in brief
02. Develop the methodology of article in cooperate with the analytical tools of the research
03. Recheck the reference list
04. The content of your article has to undergo proofreading