

Paper: “Inmates' Wives' Dedication to Their Partners at Nigeria's Agodi-Ibadan Medium Correctional Facility”

Submitted: 24 March 2023

Accepted: 11 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Christian Matthew Adetunji

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n11p32](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n11p32)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oscar Esparza-Del Villar
Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, Mexico

Reviewer 2: 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: Oscar Armando Esparza Del Villar, Ph. D.	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez / Mexico	
Date Manuscript Received: April 4, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: April 6, 2023
Manuscript Title: Inmates' wives' unusual dedication at Nigeria's Agodi-Ibadan Medium Correctional Facility	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0416/23	
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

The title could be better. As it is, it does not directly indicate what the study is about.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is fine.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The grammar is fine.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The methods are clearly explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
The results are clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I recommend adding and explaining Satir's model since it's used at the end to explain part of the results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
References are fine	

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):

I recommend two changes before being accepted:

1. I recommend adding and explaining Satir's model since it's used at the end to explain part of the results.
2. Table 1 needs notes on the bottom to explain what each abbreviation means (e.g., ATM).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I think this is a good study. I recommend two changes before being accepted:

1. I recommend adding and explaining Satir's model since it's used at the end to explain part of the results.

2. Table 1 needs notes on the bottom to explain what each abbreviation means (e.g., ATM).