

**Paper: “A Quantitative Approach to the Study of Deviant Usage of Mood and Modality in Argumentative Essays of Second Year Students of Berekum College of Education”**

**Submitted: 03 February 2022**

**Accepted: 25 March 2022**

**Published: 31 March 2022**

Corresponding Author: Christopher Gyau

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n9p20](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n9p20)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sufi Amin

International Islamic University, Islambad Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

the title of the study is clear clear and adequate

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

1. Abstract is a self-contained, short, and powerful statement that describes a larger work. Abstract carries a number of structural and grammatical errors. The abstract is most widely read section of the thesis therefore it should be free of

errors and should be written in clear and correct language. Therefore, The following scheme for the abstract of the study may be adopted:

- a) A statement of your main topic, purpose and objectives
- b) A brief description of the methodology
- c) An overview of the most significant findings or arguments
- d) A summary of your conclusions and recommendations

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

There are plenty of grammatical mistakes in the whole paper. English grammar of the whole thesis is required to be reviewed and sentence/syntax mistakes are to be removed.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*


(Please insert your comments)

Methodology section is weak. It needs clarification. Researcher did not mention proper research design. It is recommended to mention proper research design in methodology

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)



**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Conclusions are inadequate  
and not properly drawn.  
Conclusions should be  
based on findings.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Comprehensive and appropriate

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*


- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**



**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*


*(Please insert your comments)*

The title is clear and adequate

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*



**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

Further proofreading is needed to address a few inconsistencies

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Although the study methods are explained quite clearly the author/s should mention the limitations of the study

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is clear and tables help illustrate the results

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Although the conclusion is accurate, suggestions for further research should be mentioned

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The majority of the research papers and articles mentioned were written before 2018. The references could be improved by quoting also more recent articles.



***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear author/s,  
your article is interesting and well-organised. In my opinion, only minor changes and improvements are needed.  
The reviewer

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**