Paper: **"Common Property: English as a Lingua Franca in Ghana, The Perspective of the College of Education Tutor"**

Corresponding Author: Grace Donkor

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Farah Dashti
College of Education at Public Authority for Applied Education and Training in Kuwait

Reviewer 3: Haggag Mohamed Haggag
South Valley University, Egypt

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ⦿ 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

(Please insert your comments)

I would recommend linking "popular property to "English as a Lingua Franca . I would also recommend replacing"perspectives" with singular "perspective" .

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear but requires further elaboration and structural revision "e,g Participant tutor's... could be ".

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

The paper requires spelling and grammar checking (e.g normativity, semantical, curricula priporitizes"

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The method is clear but as to questionnaire, there should be a description of reliability and validity adjustments since it is the key instrument in the paper. The qualitative excerpts and feedback added to the quality of the paper.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body is concise and well organized except for misplacing limitation and implications. I would recommend adding limitations after the results followed by implications before the conclusion part.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is clear and cohesive but should not be followed by "pedagogical implications".

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

References are well written but old-dated; there should be up-to-date references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ◉ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1

- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ◉ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is well designed and the qualitative input used in the paper added to its value.

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ○ 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The phrase "popular property" is a little vague. I would suggest the use of the phrase "Common Property" instead of the "Popular Property" used by the authors. Probably the authors had in mind the idea of English as belonging to all members of the community. I found a similar title in a 2007 article, see the link below:

https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8_11

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear, highlighting the methods, results and recommendations.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

I couldn't find any grammatical or spelling errors, just a couple of spacing mistakes that can be easily noticed and resolved.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The methods are meticulously
presented and explained.
```

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

*

(Please insert your comments)

I could not observe any major mistake, neither spelling, nor grammatical errors. Again, a few spacing error, and a couple of commas needed here and there. I suggest revising the format of the text.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
Although brief, conclusions and
supported by the content.
```

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

```
The list of references is
carefully organised
and comprehensive.
```

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ⦿ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3

- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ◉ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No further comments.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: