



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p><input type="checkbox"/> the <b>Abstract</b> (as well as the whole document) should be revised – avoid repetitions (e.g.: conclusions are exactly the same that information provided in discussion);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the <b>introduction</b> should be restructured: explanation provided around the rationale and details around this is very limited and so is suggested to authors to focus on the pertinence of the topic as well on some evidences in the area. Further, it would be useful to also include an explanation of why this overview is particularly of interest on the international level as this is not explicitly stated in the article. Relevant gaps should be identified and related to research questions;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Methods:</b> I do have, however, reservations of a rather severe nature concerning <b>method</b>. This is maybe the main aspect that should be reframed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Sample</i> is not described and therefore needs to be more explicit: please introduce a table (or at least describe) participants' demographic characteristics; further, please introduce inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as how participants were selected; Please justify the sample size adequacy</li> <li>- <i>Instrument:</i> is this a new questionnaire? If so, the authors should clarify where they based the questions and which methods used for analysing some qualities (content validity, reliability...)</li> <li>- <i>Procedures:</i> Please ensure all details regarding ethical approval procedures processes are included in the msc, as well instrument application process;</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Results:</b> evidences should not be base only in percentages or median (not average) scores; the lack of considering other variables/factors that might have influenced the results; the lack of an indication of how the methods employed would logically lead to the results obtained; although tables are clear, the authors tend to duplicate information in text and so the suggestion is to re-organize tables and delete repetitions - please try to present the fundamental data; hypothesis should be based on recent empirical studies and in this study still lacks theoretical rationales - you need to show to the readers the logical premises based on theories that support the proposed relationships/theoretical</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Discussion:</b> is not supposed to repeat results. With few results to work with it is again hard to ascertain the discussion and how this study will impact future research. The discussion section would be greatly enhanced by adding a limitations sub-section.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Conclusion:</b> the author is suggested to sum up the main conclusions found, based on findings, avoiding generalizations that are not possible within the study. What are the practical implications of this study?</p>	<p>First paragraph shows why the overview is important on international scale</p> <p>Second paragraph shows the importance of English in Africa and the rationale and pertinence of the topic</p> <p>Third paragraphs shows some evidence in the area (Nigeria)</p> <p>The fourth paragraph identified research gap and related it to the research question</p> <p>1: Part of the first This described the sample selection process.</p> <p>2: The second part explains the inclusion and exclusion criteria used in the study</p> <p>3: Description of the demographic characteristics is part of another paper; hence it was not included in this paper to avoid duplication of data.</p> <p>4: Part of the second paragraph explains where the questions were based, the content, validity and reliability and method of data analysis as well as ethical approval procedure</p> <p>Results were obtained from analysis using percentages and mean. Methods of data collection were presented in the methodology section. Repeated information in text and figures were deleted</p> <p>Corrected in results and discussion.</p> <p>Acknowledged and corrected in discussion sections.</p> <p>Acknowledged and corrected in conclusion and recommendation.</p>