

Paper: **“National Dialogue of Ethiopia: is it on the right track?”**

Submitted: 01 May 2022

Accepted: 01 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Dehinasew Shemelis Andualem

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p71

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Favio Farinella
Universidad Nacional of Mar del Plata, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Sharad K. Soni
Jawaharlal Nehru University/India

Reviewer 3: Haileyesus Muluken
Ethiopian Civil Service University, Ethiopia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Haileyesus Muluken(PhD)	
University/Country: Ethiopian Civil Service University	
Date Manuscript Received: May 9, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: May 12,2022
Manuscript Title: National Dialog of Ethiopia: is it on the right track?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0530/22	
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>(It is good title that is adequate for the article content. Ethiopia is conducting a national dialogue at this moment. The manuscript is discussing those issues in the author title as well as the content of the manuscript. Despite the issue has still not ripened very well, this manuscript critically explained the initial ongoing process of the national dialogue in Ethiopia. For me it is good to write a manuscript like this. It is timely. It will serve for academicians and various stakeholders as a spring board to write about the national dialogue in Ethiopia.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Yes, It is clearly presented. It is very short and precise)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(I have seen few typos errors in the manuscript)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(It is good)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(The result are clear. However some bold assertion statement needs a substantiated argument)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Yes, It is supported. The conclusion part is showing the main argument of the author)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Yes, It is comprehensive and Appropriate)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):The reviewer reviewed the manuscript and I have recommend you to incorporate those constructive comments. Please see the reviewed manuscript.

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: Prof. Sharad K Soni	
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University/India	
Date Manuscript Received: May 10, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: May 21, 2022
Manuscript Title: National Dialog of Ethiopia: is it on the right track?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0530/22	
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

<i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article as discussed and analysed by the authors in the body of the text. But the spelling of Dialog should be changed as Dialogue which is more acceptable internationally.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects and results but not methods.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes have been found here and there. However, it can be rectified and correctly during copy-editing.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The study methods remain absent.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The result of the research as explained in the body of the paper appears to be clear. But copy-editing is required.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion appears to be accurate and supported by the content. But copy-editing is required to make it more clear for the sake of the readers.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references can be considered as comprehensive and appropriate given that the article is within 3000 words and relates to the subject matter of the article.</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 demonstrates a good piece of research work but needs minor revision being suggested as follows: (1) The spelling of **Dialog** should be changed as **Dialogue** which is more acceptable internationally; (2) Methods need to be highlighted in the Abstract; (3) Since study methods are absent in the body-text it needs to be written/included; (4) Results and Conclusion are fine but copy-editing is required to make them clearer by rectifying and correcting grammatical errors and language.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper is a good piece of research work which demonstrates seriousness on the part of the authors to deal with the subject. However, as suggested to the authors, the paper needs minor revision as follows: (1) The spelling of **Dialog** should be changed as **Dialogue** which is more acceptable internationally; (2) Methods need to be highlighted in the Abstract; (3) Since study methods are absent in the body-text it needs to be written/included; (4) Results and Conclusion are fine but copy-editing is required to make them clearer by rectifying and correcting grammatical errors and language. After revision the paper is worth publishing as it appears to be a new analysis of the subject undertaken by the authors which may prove to be beneficial to both the academics and policymakers.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Favio Farinella	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional of Mar del Plata, Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/05/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/05/22
Manuscript Title National Dialog of Ethiopia: is it on the right track?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 30.05.2022	
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.	5
The title well describes the content which is dealt by the paper, about the undergoing national dialogue in Ethiopia and prospects for success. The author advances that according to his views, the national dialogue in Ethiopia is not going to achieve the desired goal.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
The abstract only partially introduces the object, methods and results of research. While the object and hypothesis are clear, the methodology to come to the results is lacking. About the latter, there is only a general statement about a probable failure of the dialogue but maybe some more arguments may be introduced at this initial point.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Neither major grammatical errors nor spelling mistakes were detected along the article. Only in page 1, para. 2, the name of the author cited should be mentioned within the parenthesis.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
As we have stated in number 2, the methodology on which the study is based should be clearly explained and later developed. There is only a mention about a comparison made among international principles and recommendations and the Ethiopian Dialogue itself which is not enough.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
The results are expressed in the conclusion (page 5) in seven lines. The subject that the author is dealing with deserves and certainly can have a greater elaboration regarding each of the different analysed edges of the Ethiopian national dialogue.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
The study concludes by reaffirming each of the conclusions reached when comparing certain international documents with the situation in Ethiopia. At this point it is advisable to deepen the personal analysis arguing the reasons why a discouraging perspective is affirmed.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The bibliographic references support the statements made. They are appropriate and updated.	

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):

This is an interesting paper which could surely be enhanced according to the former comments and suggestions. According to this, the methodology used should be explained, and results and conclusions should be enlarged and elaborated.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: