



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Educational Language Policies in Nigeria and Zimbabwe: The Impact of EMI and Indigenous Languages on Educational Inclusion”

Submitted: 21 April 2026

Accepted: 22 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Oris Tom-Lawyer

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n17p77

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nemira Mačianskienė
Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Reviewer 2: Salvador Bautista Maldonado
Universidad Autonoma del Carmen, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Nemira Mačianskienė	
University, Country: Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania	
Date Manuscript Received: 2026-04-27	Date Review Report Submitted: 2026-05-15
Manuscript Title: Educational Language Polices in Nigeria and Zimbabwe: The Role of Educational Inclusion	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38	
You agree that 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:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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 for the content of the article.	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Language Policies (Language Policy rather than Police)</i> • <i>The second part of the title does not cohere with the research findings: the role of EMI and indigenous languages as the medium of instruction are analyzed with regard to their impact on educational inclusion rather than the role of educational inclusion.</i> 	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some inadequacies in punctuation (commas are used with compound predicates; a lack of comma connecting independent clauses in compound sentences);</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Some inadequacies: the first 2 paragraphs of Methodology section (describing 4 categories or themes) are almost identical.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p><i>APA style is not followed correctly:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Inconsistent use of & and 'and' to join two authors or before the third author in parentheses;</i> <i>2. Incorrect secondary source citations (Thondlana, 2002; cited in Sibanda, 2019);</i> <i>3. The format of headings does not follow APA requirements.</i> 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): The article presents a relevant study that aims at filling in a critical gap in the field of language policy and its impact of educational inclusion. However, minor inadequacies need to be addressed before accepting it to publication.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: SALVADOR BAUTISTA MALDONADO	
University, Country: Universidad Autonoma del Carmen, Mexico.	
Date Manuscript Received: 30.04.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.05.2026
Manuscript Title: Educational Language Polices in Nigeria and Zimbabwe: The Role of Educational Inclusion	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38 13.05.2026	
You agree that 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:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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 for the content of the article.	5
<i>It clearly reflects all the content treated in the manuscript.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract follows the criteria of a well written review.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>It was detected no mistakes or slips of the keyboard.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Sure, it explains and provide evidence of both countries previous studies related to the topic.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>According to the evidence presented, it seems that the info presented is real.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Clearly supported.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references all well formatted.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

General comments: A very nice and smooth comparison.

Opinion: It does seem that it happens in some places in Mexico and in South America where English and indigenous languages are taught simultaneously. It is evident that English is preferred, but we do need evidence to prove it. You nicely provided an excellent support in evidence reviewing previous studies of the topic. Congrats!!!!