

**Paper: “Silence as Leadership Communication: Public Perception, Interpretation, and Negotiated Meaning”**

**Submitted: 05 July 2023**

**Accepted: 28 August 2023**

**Published: 31 August 2023**

Corresponding Author: Anthony U. Utulu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n22p71](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n22p71)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edona Ilukaçaj  
Beder University College, Albania

Reviewer 2: Orungbeja, Babatunde  
Babcock University, Nigeria

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Edona Llukacaj	
University/Country: Beder University College, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: July 19, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: July 25, 2023
Manuscript Title: The Effect of Silence on the Human Communication System	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>3</b>

<i>The title is too general for this article, which does not focus on the impact of silence in the entirety of the human communication system but that of leaders' - more precisely of a leader - at a certain period.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract is well- built, includes all the necessary information –objects, methods &amp; results-, and is utterly compliant with the article.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are grammatical errors that should be fixed before publication; these sentences or clauses have mostly been highlighted. Special attention should be paid to the use of the possessive “’s”, the dashes “- -”, the absence of article “the” as well as to the incorrect use of certain terms. Quite often, helpful comments have also been added.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The Methodology along with the reasons why it was used are explained in details by the author, which are sufficient to convince the reader for its adequacy and efficiency.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are clear and clearly presented by the authors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are adequate and supported by the data, results and authors' comments.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are rich and point out that the authors conducted a detailed research on their topic.</i>	

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

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

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

The interview questions could have been added as an appendix to this paper.

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

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Babatunde Orungbeja	
University/Country: Babcock University. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: August 10, 2023
Manuscript Title: <b>THE EFFECT OF SILENCE ON THE HUMAN COMMUNICATION SYSTEM</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0740/23</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## 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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<i>The title is a lot broader than the content of the article. It could be better conceived in consonance with the article's content.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There is a succinct depiction of the objects, methods and results in the article.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Some of the errors have been highlighted in the review via the 'Track changes' system.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>A lot more justice could have been done to clearly explicate the qualitative design and its applicability in this regard.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results (qualitative) do not contain errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are precise and a function of the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>The references are adequate and applicable to the study.</i>	

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

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

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

Text analysis of some publications (e.g. newspaper editorials) on the mentioned crises would have added more flesh to the study.

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