
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 10.04.2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 23.04.2018
Manuscript Title: THE MACEDONIANS OF ISLAMIC RELIGION IN THE CONTEXT OF IDENTITY THEORIES (ethnic, religious and cultural context)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 98,04.2018	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The study methods are adequate for the essay.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4,5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> I marked errors in the text	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusions is very good	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i> There is lack in the references: the monograph of A.D.Smith from 2004, which is cited in the body of the article, but not in the references.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> There is error in the references, in second position: Anderson Benedict (2006, it should be write from the new line. There is error on page 8th, in the footnote number 6: (Mirjana Mirchevska, 2011). It should be: (Mirchevska, 20011).	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is very interesting and important. The author of the article presented rare perspective on the issue, but in the Introduction an understanding of the term Macedonians and Slavonic nation (page 2) is completely unclear (see my commentary on the page 2 in the body of the text). The disadvantage of the article is lack of broader illustration of the identity question in the Ottoman Macedonia. In 19th century Ottoman Macedonia people who defined as Macedonians of islamic religion were a significant part of these territory. I recomend the first issue of *Colloquia Humanistica* (2012), the text of a conversation recorded in Ladino, entitled *Las fronteras de Macedonia la konversasion de Geortche Petrov (1864/5–1921) kon Teodor Herzl (1860–1904) eskrita in ladino 1* (2012). I recomend either as a context of the problem disussed in the essey a research and chapter prepared for the monograph *Macedonia: Land, Region, Borderland* (2013) by Rigels Halili (*Macedonians in Albania – from ethnic group to national minority*).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I assessed the article on its merit, not from the point of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. In *Colloquia Humanistica* it is a task for native-speaker.

