

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: <b>8th Dec. 2017</b> Sent on December 10, 2017
Manuscript Title: <b>The involvement of Mary Magdalene in the sacrificial death of Jesus on the cross: lessons for the Nigerian Christian women</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1209/17</b>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The title is clear enough and it is almost adequate to the content of the paper.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b> <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The abstract is not explicit about the methodology used to conduct this research.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>Nothing special to report.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b> <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	<b>3</b>

<b>The research methods used to carry out this research are not explained.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The body of this paper is sufficiently clear and contains no obvious errors.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>Both the summary and the conclusions are adequately related to the content of the paper.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The references are comprehensive and appropriate but not sufficient.</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- 1- Sisters Martha and Mary Magdalene, two great figures of Christian hospitality, are one of the themes of the Gospels unceasingly revisited: Mary Magdalene is distinguished by her hospitality offered spontaneously and generously allowing her to access Salvation. Martha is also distinguished by this hospital function while remaining secondary. Why didn't you mention the role of Martha, Magdalene's sister? ...
- 2- the research work of Victor de Saxer, a great specialist of Mary Magdalene, could have been fruitful for your paper ...

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**