

Paper: “Socio – Economic and Financial Effects of Kidnapping in Birnin Gwari Local Government Area of Kaduna State”

Submitted: 28 July 2022

Accepted: 31 January 2023

Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: Akintola Ismail

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n4p42](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n4p42)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Iresha Lakshman
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 2: Paul Waithaka
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Paul Waithaka	
University/Country: Kenyatta University/Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/12/2022
Manuscript Title: Socio-Economic and Financial Effects of Kidnapping in Birnin Gwari Local Government Area of Kaduna State	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0828/22	
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.	4

There is need to include the name of the country where the study was done in the title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Improve sentence construction in the abstract	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are many grammatical errors in the paper	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
There need to indicate the research design used in the study. The target population of the study from which the sample is selected should be made very clear	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Ensure the write up refers to the correct table	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
Conclusions are accurate and supported	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2.5
Ensure to comply with the requirements of the referencing system being used	

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):

- 1) Ensure citations comply with the system being used in the paper
- 2) Some sections in the background of the study are deficient of citation
- 3) Avoid paragraphs made up of one or two sentences
- 4) Paragraphs should not start with words/names in brackets such as (Wood et al., 2004)
- 5) Ensure subsection in the background of the study are numbered appropriately
- 6) Strengthen the statement of the problem by providing statistics/data
- 7) Under the subtitle Discussions of the Findings. The first line reads ‘The goal if this “Chapter”... which is this chapter?’
- 8) Ensure tables are numbered sequentially for instance table 16 is followed by table 18 indicating that table 17 is omitted. Table 18 is followed by table 4.2.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper should be accepted for publishing after the authors have made recommended corrections

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: Iresha M. Lakshman	
University/Country: University of Colombo, Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 20.10.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01.12.2022
Manuscript Title: SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL EFFECTS OF KIDNAPPING IN BIRNIN GWARI LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0820/22	
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>(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
<p>Language checking is required before publishing. Use of Don't and It's should be corrected along with some other changes.</p> <p>Also in-text citations must be checked. URLs are given some places as in-text citation. When sentence begins with author names, brackets must be removed and the names be made part of the sentence with publication year appearing in brackets.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Findings are presented in bullet/point form. I find this easier to follow. However, I do not know if this is in agreement with ESJ guidelines.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Yes in most cases. See my comment under number 3 above.	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: