

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: June 4 th , 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: June 7 th , 2018
Manuscript Title: RELATIONSHIP AS A PRESUPPOSITION OF MERCY IN LUKE 15:25-32: A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE TO RECONCILIATION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0610/18	

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.	1
<i>- The title is blurry and needs to be reconsidered. Also its size should be adjusted</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>- The abstract does not reflect nor respect the academic standards</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There is a serious problem with the language.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>- Punctuation is a real issue. It should be also reconsidered in references.</i> <i>- There are a lot of repetitions and redundancy.</i> <i>- I highly recommend proofreading by a native scholar.</i> 	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
- <i>There is no single idea about the methodology.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
- <i>There is no coherence nor cohesion. I feel there is just cut and paste because there is no logic in sentence construction nor paragraph unity.</i> - <i>The paper is merely preaching rather than analyzing</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
- <i>The conclusion is poorly constructed and weak.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>It is well structured and substantial.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Please go through the paper and correct the highlighted errors.
- Reconsider the whole paper because it does not respond to academic standards.
- Have your paper proofread by a native scholar.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: