

Paper: “Featural Identity and the Obligatory Contour Principle: Perspective from the Sound Pattern of Standard British English and Nigerian English”

Submitted: 04 March 2022

Accepted: 20 June 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Don Chukwuemeka Utulu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p15](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p15)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marinella Lorinczi
University of Cagliari, Italy

Reviewer 2: Dramane Ouattara
Alassane Ouattara University of Bouake, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: DRAMANE OUATTARA	
University/Country: Alassane Ouattara University of Bouake	
Date Manuscript Received: March 7, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Featural Identity and the OCP: Perspective from the Sound Pattern of Standard British English and Nigerian English	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0345/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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.	5
The title of the Paper is clear enough. It is not only in line with the point discussed in the Paper, but also in terms of views and arguments it is innovative and ground-	

<p>breaking. The Paper focuses its argumentation on both standard British English and African Nigerian English. From this point, the Paper shows clearly how each language holds some linguistics fixation depending on its occurrence and which matches up with some linguistic components in English, British or Nigerian one.</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>In my mind, the abstract obeys almost the required criteria. It summarizes the points discussed on the Paper. This section is the most interesting one, as it succeeds in raising the issues along with the methodology that will be applied to back up the investigations on one hand, and presents the findings of its author on the other hand.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The author of the Paper should have to go back in the Paper so that to correct some grammatical errors along with stylistic misspelling. I tried to correct some of them, but the author would rather undertake and or carry out serious and profound correction as far these stylistic errors are concerned. I underlined and corrected in (red color) some stylistic errors, and for the remaining correction, the author has to cope with it as quickly as possible.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The methods in the Paper are not clearly explained. To my mind, they need additional and bright clarification. The Autosegmental Theory and Optimality Theory must shortly be explained in order to strengthen their use in this Paper.</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The results derive from the author's application of the theories. There is therefore a close link between what the Paper raises as issue and the final point it stated as results from the previous problematic. Sometimes the application of theories and the results it brings about appear in a board for convenience.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	
<p>The Paper's conclusion is the most interesting one. It summarizes the main idea of the Paper, and clearly conclude that "representations of similarity or duplication of structures in L2 phonology, is not exclusive to native grammars". This conclusion opens new trends for research.</p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The Bibliography is truly rich enough and instructive. It contains forty-one references of works, and alphabetically ordered. But, the weakest aspect of this bibliography stands the way the author manages the presentation of the works the bibliography contains. Sometime the publication dates are not put into bracket, other time, the title of works are not italicized. The way the author presents his bibliography brings about confusion between Books, articles, magazines, thesis. The author must as rapidly as possible go through his bibliography, correct it so that it meets the required presentation. In addition, quotations do not appear within</p>	

quotation marks. This situation is continuously repeated in the whole text, and brings about confusion.

An example of Bibliography

Richard, Taylor, & John Edward (1838). *The British and Foreign Review, or European Quarterly Journal*. London: Red Lion Court, Fleet Street

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):

Please, read my comment carefully and follow its the recommendation. I wish the Paper returned for some useful and profound correction. The topic this research Paper develops is so interesting and paramount that its revision for publication stands as pious recommendation.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper needs revision (even minor) and possibly resubmission.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Marinella Lőrinczi	
University/Country: retired , University of Cagliari/ Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 7.III.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 14.III.2022
Manuscript Title: Featural Identity and the OCP: Perspective from the Sound Pattern of Standard British English and Nigerian English	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0345/22	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I RECOMMEND TO AVOID PERSONIFICATIONS AS “some **languages**, it has been shown, seem **to care** less about such similarity effects...”

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: