

Review of: "Government interference in election administration and lethal electoral irregularities in Africa: Evidence from Nigeria"

Hazzan Moses Kayode¹

¹ University of Ibadan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors deserve commendation for surgically looking into the historical phases of electoral activities in the Nigerian body polities. The paper surgically shows what often transpires in the Nigerian so-called electoral practices which could be aptly described as pseudo-electoral. However, the following comments and suggestions could be taken into consideration in a bid to improve the quality of the work:

- “This period began with the 1990 protest against an undemocratic rule in the Republic of Benin to the 1999 commencement of democratic rule in Nigeria (page 2)” – I think there is a need to properly conceptualise ‘democratic rule and undemocratic rule’ in this treatise. I think the concept of ‘democracy’ is relative and it goes beyond mere conducting of elections which has hitherto become an albatross to Nigerian politics.
- “**Between 1999 and 1999**, many African countries dethroned dictatorial, military, or one-party states and embraced multiparty politics embedded in electoral democratic practice (page 2)”. – The authors need to properly edit this section. Another issue that needs critical interrogation is whether multiparty politics is one of the fundamental hallmarks of democratic practice.
- “These countries respectively established electoral institutions like electoral management bodies (EMBs) as statutory authorities charged with election administration in line with global practice”. – How global is this practice? This assertion equally needs critical interrogation.
- There is a need for consistency in the patterns (that is, the arrangement of the citations) of citations by the authors.
- The x-ray of the government interference in a particular section of the paper is quite logical and therefore commendable. Nevertheless, the authors need to grammatically overhaul this section and also correct all the typographical errors.
- **Methodology**

“Accordingly, the 12 states were **purposefully selected** – I think there is a need to justify the use of the purposeful sampling technique. For instance, it is expected that the choice of this sampling technique must have been informed by at least a peculiar characteristic that warrants its choice. In other words, could it have been that the states that were purposefully sampled had hitherto recorded the highest cases of electoral irregularities in a particular year or over a certain period of time? A plausible justification must be provided for the sampling technique.

- **Results**

The authors should rectify the typographical errors sustained in the dating.