

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_96978
Title of the Manuscript:	Horizontal Inequality and West Africa's Worsening Security: Case Studies of Mali and Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The social inequality related original research article is the theme of this research, which is significant for future insights and potential solutions.</p> <p>2. The title of this manuscript is adequate.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is good.</p> <p>5. The manuscript represents scientific insight into social inequalities and theories regarding various arguments and evidence supporting it.</p> <p>6. References are reasonable.</p> <p>7. This article is engaging and straightforward, but some corrections are needed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are many redundancies, missing determiners, and grammatical errors. English writing needs additional work. Some of the words repeatedly appear in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some of your sentences may need to be clarified and easier to follow, so I rewrote them for clarity. I also rewrote some parts of your manuscript, so consider implementing it. Mark based on the the following parameters:</p> <p>1. Scientific rigor – The paper is understandable. All references are correct.</p> <p>2. Significance - This review article represents good research on relevant topics.</p> <p>3. Originality – This article provides in-depth information about relevant topics.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kristijan Krstic
Department, University & Country	University of Kragujevac, Serbia