

Review of: "The Three-Decade Journey of Nation-State Formation: Examining Strategic Planning Models and Policy Frameworks Tailored for the Sequential Stages of Nation-Building, Emphasizing the Significance of Each Phase in the Overall Development and Sustainability of a Nation-State"

Remi Okeke¹

¹ Madonna University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This work is guilty of verbosity.

The topic is verbose and rather essay-like. Why is the topic not simply this: "The Three-Decade Journey of Nation-State Formation: Examining Strategic Planning Models and Policy Frameworks"? See what the author still went ahead to add to the topic: "Tailored for the Sequential Stages of Nation-Building, Emphasizing the Significance of Each Phase in the Overall Development and Sustainability of a Nation-State." So the putative topic of the work became: "The Three-Decade Journey of Nation-State Formation: Examining Strategic Planning Models and Policy Frameworks Tailored for the Sequential Stages of Nation-Building, Emphasizing the Significance of Each Phase in the Overall Development and Sustainability of a Nation-State." This is not acceptable.

The abstract is also verbose and needs to be shortened. Still from the abstract, the submission is described as "strategic analysis." The meaning of strategic analysis as a research design in this submission is not clear. Is it because of "Strategic Planning Models" in the topic?

Then here is an immense contradiction: The abstract has about twenty lines while the introduction has only nine lines. This reviewer opines that the abstract should be used as the introduction and the introduction should be used as the abstract, provided that the concept of "strategic analysis" as a research design is "strategically" explained at once.

And in any case, the most misleading thing about the submission is its claim to be treating nation building. The author is not alone in this tendency by some scholars to be treating other matters while claiming to be focusing on nation building. Indeed, the current contribution is on national development, not nation building, which is a totally different concept from what the author was treating. There is also the issue of "nation-state formation" in the assumed topic. Nation-state formation and nation building are yet different concepts again. So we have highly misleading issues here and there in this submission.

Final word: Modify this topic. Take into consideration the observations in this review.

