REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.:   IJAR-55452

Title: Deconflicting Nigeria\'s Inter-agency Intelligence Rivalry: An Effective Measure to the Security Operations Against Armed Banditry and Kidnapping for Ransom in Northwest Nigeria

Reviewer Name: Dr. Jyotika Singh

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		Yes		
Techn. Quality		Yes		
Clarity	Yes			
Significance	Yes			

Reviewers' report: This manuscript critically examines inter-agency intelligence rivalry in Nigeria's security operations against armed banditry and kidnapping, using qualitative methods and Organizational Culture and Identity Theory. Strengths include timely policy relevance and practical recommendations for legal reforms and fusion centers, though limitations in sample size and generalizability warrant broader data. Overall, it offers valuable insights for security studies but requires minor revisions for clarity and depth before publication. Recommended for acceptance with edits.

Reasons for minor changes: This manuscript provides a timely and insightful analysis of inter-agency intelligence rivalry hindering Nigeria's security operations against armed banditry and kidnapping in the northwest region, employing qualitative methods and Organizational Culture and Identity Theory. Key findings highlight factors like bureaucratic silos and trust deficits, with recommendations for legal reforms and regional fusion centers to enhance coordination. While strengths include policy relevance and data triangulation, limitations such as small sample size and regional focus suggest the need for broader empirical support. Overall, the paper contributes meaningfully to security studies but would benefit from minor revisions for clarity and depth, making it suitable for publication with edits. Recommended for acceptance in a relevant journal.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Introduction

The manuscript addresses a critical issue in Nigeria's national security framework: inter-agency rivalry among intelligence and law enforcement agencies and its detrimental impact on operations against armed banditry and kidnapping for ransom in the northwest region. The paper employs a qualitative research approach, integrating secondary data from policy documents and primary data from interviews with security personnel and civilians. It draws on Organizational Culture and Identity Theory to explain the persistence of rivalry, emphasizing factors like bureaucratic silos, trust deficits, and institutional superiority complexes. The introduction effectively sets the stage by contextualizing the problem within global intelligence coordination trends (e.g., post-9/11 lessons) and Nigeria's specific challenges, such as porous borders and illicit arms proliferation. However, the abstract and introduction could benefit from tighter language to avoid minor grammatical inconsistencies (e.g., "tend to distort" should be "tends to distort" for subject-verb agreement). Overall, the paper's focus on deconflicting rivalry as a pathway to enhanced security operations is timely and relevant, given the ongoing threats in Nigeria's northwest.

Objectives

The research objectives are clearly articulated and align well with the stated research questions: (1) identifying factors sustaining inter-agency intelligence rivalry, and (2) proposing enhancements to Nigeria's inter-agency mechanisms. These objectives are achievable within the qualitative framework, focusing on policy analysis, thematic data interpretation, and theoretical application. The objectives demonstrate a logical progression from problem identification to solution-oriented recommendations, grounded in Nigeria's strategic security documents (e.g., National Security Strategy 2019). Strengths include the explicit linkage to practical outcomes, such as legal reforms and fusion centers. However, the objectives could be more specific in quantifying expected impacts (e.g., how enhanced coordination might reduce incident rates), and the paper might clarify how primary data from a limited sample (68 respondents across two states) directly addresses national-level policy gaps.

Results

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The results section effectively synthesizes data from policy documents, interviews, and literature, presenting key findings on factors like bureaucratic bottlenecks, trust issues, and technological gaps sustaining rivalry. Thematic analysis reveals operational deficiencies, such as reliance on community-driven intelligence rather than integrated fusion centers, and the absence of legal mandates for information sharing. Findings are supported by direct quotes from interviews and references to policy excerpts, enhancing credibility. The juxtaposition of secondary and primary data is a strength, as it triangulates evidence (e.g., policy rhetoric vs. field realities). However, the results could be more robust with quantitative elements, such as frequency counts of recurring themes from interviews, to bolster claims. Some findings (e.g., the Nigeria Police Force's role as first responder) are compelling but lack empirical depth, such as statistical correlations between rivalry and operational failures. Overall, the results directly address the research questions and provide actionable insights, though visual aids like tables summarizing themes would improve readability.

Discussions

The discussion section adeptly interprets findings through the lens of Organizational Culture and Identity Theory, linking historical institutional practices to ongoing rivalry. It effectively connects results to broader literature (e.g., Nte, 2012; International Crisis Group, 2022), highlighting implications for national security, such as how rivalry enables criminal adaptability. The paper's recommendations—e.g., enacting binding legal frameworks and establishing regional fusion centers—are practical and policy-oriented, aligning with global best practices. Strengths include the critical analysis of policy gaps and the emphasis on community intelligence as a workaround. However, the discussion occasionally overgeneralizes (e.g., attributing all operational failures to rivalry without considering external variables like funding shortages). It could better integrate counterarguments, such as potential resistance to centralized fusion centers due to agency autonomy. The section contributes meaningfully to knowledge by advocating for deconflicting measures, but it would benefit from a clearer distinction between short-term fixes (e.g., training) and long-term reforms (e.g., legislative changes).

Limitations

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Several limitations are evident, some acknowledged by the authors (e.g., scope limited to two northwest states and reliance on qualitative data). The small sample size (68 respondents) and purposive sampling may introduce selection bias, potentially overlooking perspectives from higher-ranking officials or non-respondents. The paper's heavy reliance on secondary policy documents risks overemphasizing official rhetoric over ground realities, and the qualitative method lacks triangulation with quantitative metrics (e.g., incident data). Temporal limitations, such as data collected in 2024, may not capture recent developments (e.g., post-2024 policy shifts). Additionally, the focus on northwest Nigeria excludes comparative insights from other regions, limiting generalizability. Ethical considerations, while mentioned, could be expanded to address potential biases in interviews. These limitations do not undermine the paper's value but suggest the need for broader data sources in future iterations.

Strengths

The manuscript's strengths lie in its rigorous qualitative methodology, including thematic and document analysis, which provides in-depth insights into a understudied topic. The theoretical framework (Organizational Culture and Identity Theory) is well-applied, offering a novel lens for understanding rivalry in Nigeria's context. The paper's policy relevance is a key asset, with practical recommendations that could inform reforms in the Office of the National Security Adviser. Data triangulation (primary interviews, secondary documents, and literature) enhances trustworthiness, and the clear structure facilitates readability. Contributions to knowledge include highlighting community intelligence's role and critiquing policy implementation gaps, making it valuable for security studies scholars and policymakers. The writing is generally accessible, with a comprehensive reference list supporting claims.

Final Thoughts

This is a solid, policy-oriented manuscript that effectively critiques inter-agency rivalry and proposes feasible solutions, contributing to discussions on intelligence coordination in fragile security environments. It aligns with journal standards for qualitative research in security and policy studies, with potential for publication after revisions. I recommend acceptance with minor revisions to address clarity, depth, and generalizability. Suggestions include: (1) strengthening the results with more empirical evidence (e.g., visuals or appendices); (2) expanding the discussion to include counterarguments and

REVIEWER'S REPORT

comparative cases; (3) mitigating limitations through additional data or caveats; and (4) proofreading for grammar and consistency. Overall, the paper has strong potential to influence Nigerian security policy and advance academic discourse on inter-agency dynamics.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the manuscript offers a compelling analysis of inter-agency intelligence rivalry in Nigeria, with clear objectives, insightful results, and actionable recommendations. While limitations in scope and methodology exist, the paper's strengths in theoretical application and policy relevance outweigh these concerns. With targeted revisions, it could serve as a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners addressing security challenges in Nigeria and beyond. I rate it as suitable for publication in a peer-reviewed journal on security studies or public policy, pending the suggested improvements.