

Paper: **“National Speeches on Notable Political Figures”**

**Submitted: 21 November 2022**

**Accepted: 23 June 2023**

**Published: 30 June 2023**

Corresponding Author: Orungbeja Babatunde O.

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n17p128](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n17p128)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kira Trostina  
Plekhanov University of Economics, Russia

Reviewer 2: Hamidreza Izadi  
Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

# 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: <b>Dr.H.R.Izadi</b>	
University/Country: <b>Chabahr Maritime University/Iran</b>	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>DISCOURSE FRAMING OF NIGERIA'S DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES AND GOVERNMENT'S INTERVENTIONIST POLICIES IN SELECTED TELEVISED NATIONAL ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARI (2015 -2021).</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1212/22</b>	
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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

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

*in my opinion it is suitable for publication*

# 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: Kira Trostina	
University/Country: PRUE/Russia	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 Nov. 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 Dec. 2022
Manuscript Title: DISCOURSE FRAMING OF NIGERIA'S DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES AND GOVERNMENT'S INTERVENTIONIST POLICIES IN SELECTED TELEVISED NATIONAL ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARI (2015 -2021).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1212/22, Doc. titled ---40.---12.12.2022- --	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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>5</b>
<i>Clearly reflects</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract is overloaded with excessive details. It is almost the article itself. Needs shortening</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>yes, they are few, but also there are some punctuation mistakes</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>yes, quite clearly and concise</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>very accurate</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>it corresponds to the overall objective of the paper</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>fully</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):**

Suggest the authors streamline the abstract.

REFERENCES – the internet links are not according to the template.

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