

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. Yes, it is. I found the link between institutional distrust and identity radicalization particularly relevant. This is both theoretically and empirically. 2. Yes- 3. Yes. 4. Yes, but Given the references to the semi-structured interviews referred to in the abstract and methodologically relevant, I expected that excerpts from these interviews would be reported and commented on. 5. The case studies should be described better, clarifying the position of the experts contacted, defining the two case studies more homogenously and clarifying the very structure of the case studies (for example which roles, organizations and subjects were interviewed, which nature of the information collections, in which political and cultural direction the radicalization of identity is directed). 6. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes	
Optional/General comments	It is a good article, but the results of the interviews should be better specified and - on an analytical level - the operational logic and the structure of the case studies should be better described	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luca Martignani
Department, University & Country	University of Bologna, Italy