

**Paper: “Educated Parents’ Practice of Child Labour in Ekiti State, Nigeria”**

**Submitted: 24 March 2023**

**Accepted: 04 May 2023**

**Published: 31 May 2023**

Corresponding Author: Margaret F. Oluwagbohunmi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n13p79](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n13p79)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Samuel Awoniyi

Bugema University, Uganda

Reviewer 2: Luan Bekteshi

Barleti University, Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Genutė Gedvilienė

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Reviewer 4: Edna Johnny

University of Liberia, Liberia

# 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: Prof. Samuel Adebayo Awoniyi	
University/Country: Bugema University, Uganda	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/04/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/04/2023
Manuscript Title: Educated Parents' Practice of Child Labour in Ekiti State, Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.04.2023	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

The title is clear and succinct	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
Abstract is clear but author advised to include methods of data analysis before findings.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Few mistakes on words that need to be hyphenated corrected e.g., low-income	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
Clearly explained Type of t-test analysis used to be included.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Author to remove numbering on the reference list. All authors cited in-text must be listed on the references.	

**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):**

There are too many long paragraphs in the write up. A good paragraph is 6 – 11 lines according to APA format. Author requested to break down the long paragraphs accordingly

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Accept subject to minor 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!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Educated Parents' Practice of Child Labour in Ekiti State, Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/ <b>No</b>	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(P The title of the article is clear and important for revealing the results of the research.</i>	
<i>lease insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>In the abstract, the brief summary of the article is consistent. The method is presented and the results are briefly reviewed, and significant words are presented. The purpose of the article should be more clearly formulated.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The article contains grammatical and spelling errors. Corrections are needed.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The methods are presented and delivered.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The presentation of the results is brief, and a sequence of hypothesis justification is chosen. I suggest a broader interpretation of the results.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The conclusions are fragmented and need to be expanded and completed.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Corrections to the presentation of sources are necessary to comply with APA requirements.</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 article needs to be corrected. Once corrections have been made, it can be submitted for publication.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# 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: Luan Bekteshi	
University/Country: Barleti University, Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 11.04.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 14.04.2023
Manuscript Title: <b>Educated Parents' Practice of Child Labour in Ekiti State, Nigeria</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0420/23	
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]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of article</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract clearly presents object, method and results</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The article is well-written. English level of this article is OK but need some corrections.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The study methods are explained clearly</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions and recommendations are supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive.</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 paper has only a few minor grammatical errors that need to be corrected

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**Accept the article and publish with revisions.**

# 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: Edna G. Johnny	
University/Country: University of Liberia	
Date Manuscript Received: 4/13/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 4/19/2023
Manuscript Title: Educated Parents' Practice of Child Labour in Ekiti State, Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0420/23	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>



<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The file is not adequate for the content in the article</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The abstract does not clearly present the content of the paper</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>There are only few grammatical errors</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The methodology did not clearly explain the following:</b>	
<b>Why was Ekiti State selected for this study among other states?</b>	
<b>Besides the educational level of the parents, nothing else is known about their socio-economic and demographic characteristics which may also explain the practice of child labour by the respondents</b>	
<b>Where these children involved the biological parents or care givers, because according to literature cited, educated parents are less likely to use their children in child labour?</b>	
<b>Where the six selected secretariats Urban and Rural, if yes what are the types of jobs parents do in each of these areas?</b>	
<b>What are the different types of child labor practices carried out in these areas?</b>	
<b>How were the levels of child labour determined?</b>	
<b>What elements constituted these levels?</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The literature review is well explained but the methodology is not adequate which makes the result inadequate</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The conclusion does not really support the findings, rather it is based on findings from other studies</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

*The reference section is well done*

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The author did not actually show a clear evidence of educated parents' involvement in child labour. The author should improve on the methodology and the result should be based on the findings of the study and interpreted in that context.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**The author should provide more information based on the issues raised in order to arrive at the conclusion of the study.**