

# ***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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 9/12/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 9/12/2017
Manuscript Title:	
The Involvement of Mary Magdalene in the Sacrificial Death of Jesus on the Cross: Lessons for the Nigerian Christian Women	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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>	<b>4</b>
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i>	

**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):**

This is a very interesting article, publishable and thought-provoking. It however needs some editorial wok. The author employs some inconsistencies such as calling it “the paper”, the “study” etc. It needs to be replaced by “the article”. Second, the abstract does not sharply take us to the problem under discussion. The author takes us to the OT and NT in general. I was hoping that the author will directly say, “The article sets out to do ABC. Its set on the premises ABC, and the methodology is ABC ...” Such approach would have prevented it from appearing like a thesis/dissertation. The author has to edit to make it a journal article rather than a chapter in a dissertation.

The author has to indent the entire work properly. Take the case below as an example that requires proper editing in page 7:

Wallage Gail observed that this “composite Magdalene” was popularized in a sermon given by Pope Gregory I around 591 AD. Here is [an excerpt](#):

“She whom Luke calls the sinful woman, whom John calls Mary, we believe to be the Mary from whom seven devils were ejected according to Mark. And what did these seven devils signify, if not all the vices? It is clear, brothers, that the woman previously used the unguent to perfume her flesh in forbidden acts... What she therefore displayed more scandalously, she was now offering to God in a more praiseworthy manner.” — Pope Gregory the Great (Homily XXXIII).<sup>20</sup>

Why put speech marks rather than indenting?

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

