
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: 4/10/2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 4/18/2018
Manuscript Title: THE MACEDONIANS OF ISLAMIC RELIGION IN THE CONTEXT OF IDENTITY THEORIES (ethnic, religious and cultural context)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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.	4
The title is a bit awkward, I'm wondering if this due to the translation?	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Some of the writing in this paper is awkward, there are some long sentences. A few of these are noticeable in the abstract. I would recommend that they be edited in order to make the draft clearer. The writing references "we", but I only see one author's name?	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The grammar is mostly acceptable, but again, there are some awkward sentences.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

The manuscript could be improved if a discrete section be included that provided somewhat of a summary of the entire manuscript.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
I find some of the text to be overly abstruse, would suggest that author (or authors) edit the work to make some of the arguments clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
I am neither from Macedonia, nor am I religious. I am, however, aware that self-identities and national identities, be they based on language, religion or sense of “nation-hood” (or commonly shared belief of the past and present) can both be extremely complex. Regardless, I cannot help but interpret that the author (or authors) is effectively pursuing an argument that represents a call to deny the right of a particular group of people to express and recognize their distinct religious identity. For example, the author’s use the words “groundless” (referring to the recognition of distinct ethno-religious communities) and “imaginary.” To be blunt, I disagree with this argument. The author certainly has the right to make that argument, and to provide evidence to support it, but I believe the author should have some responsibility to at least acknowledge that others may disagree – particular those people who do indeed identity in distinct ways.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	4
It was my understanding that the paper should be written in English? Many of the references are not. I’m OK with that, but it does make it challenging for me to thoroughly check the reference list.	

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):

Editorial Staff
European Scientific Journal (ESJ)

Review for Manuscript: **Contribution of TRMM3b42 data to improve knowledge of rainfall in the Kayanga/Geba river basin (Republic of Guinea, Senegal, and Guinea-Bissau)**

Dear Editors,

I find the topic of this paper to be both relevant and significant. The authors have completed a decent piece of research, something that is certainly publishable. However, it is my opinion that it needs some further editing and revision prior to being accepted for the ESJ. In short, I would suggest that it be accepted, pending minor revisions.

I offer 5 specific criticisms below.

- 1) The writing style of this paper leaves something to be desired. The work is valid research, but there are a number of awkward sentences in the draft. The authors really need to edit the prose, which would enhance the clarity of the piece. If this paper is given some additional editorial work, particularly if the awkward sentences are cleaned up, it could result in a very solid paper.
- 2) I think the inclusion of reference locator map would be very effective. Perhaps one that demonstrates the geographical distributions of groups expressing distinct cultural identities.
- 3) As mentioned above, I think the author(s) need to at least be somewhat careful, and more open-minded, when it comes to referring to the identities of religious or ethnic communities as “groundless” or “irrelevant.”

In sum, I do not feel the manuscript should be published in its present form. However, it would be my suggestion that it be published once the paper is given thorough editing. If the authors, or the editors, find this review to be harsh, I trust they can understand that it was offered with the goal and spirit of improving the work. I do really appreciate the research that was completed and hope to ultimately see it in the ESJ.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

