

Paper: **“Discourse Style of Nigerian Coup Plotters”**

Submitted: 06 July 2023

Accepted: 25 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Ifeoma Nwosu-Okoli

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p89](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p89)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eka Kvantaliani
Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Marine Changiani
Tbilisi State University, Georgia

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: Marine Changiani	
University/Country: Tbilisi State University, Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.08. 2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Discourse Style of Nigerian Coup Plotters	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
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.	5
<i>The title clearly shows the main idea of the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract describes the objects, and methods, however, the results of the research are not shown clearly</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are many grammatical, stylistic and spelling mistakes in the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study methods are explained in the abstract (not enough)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>There are grammatical mistakes in “Implications of Findings” and the language of the text is not clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is accurate but short</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>In my opinion, not enough sources were used for the study. There should be more resources about this subject.</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): You should revise the whole text of your article for grammatical mistakes. The topic of the research is interesting, however, the results of the study are not described clearly.

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: Ekaterine Kvantaliani	
University/Country: Tbilisi State Medical University / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/07/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/07/2023
Manuscript Title: Discourse Style of Nigerian Coup Plotters	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0744/23	
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.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract outlines objects of the research, research methodology (as the researcher mentioned to apply both qualitative and quantitative research methodology) but does not include description of research methods, just mentioned that observation and library research was used. The results are suggested to be presented in clearer ways.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The grammatical errors are minimal but there are spelling mistakes (word grammar check is suggested to be turned on)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>There is no separate chapter/subchapter explaining study methods. It would be better to be explained independently.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The analysis of the speeches is clear, discussed consistently and outlines the major keywords or aspects</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is clear but would suggest more detailed and consistent conclusion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references need revision according to APA style</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input 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: