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: 12-01-2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:18-01-2018		
Manuscript Title: Modernité, postmodernité et impérialisme occidental			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 121.01.2018.			

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
(a brief explanationis recommendable) The title is very explicit. It relevantly encapsulates the main issue raise	d in the paper
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
(An explanation is recommendable)	
The author's aim and methods to reach this aim are clearly stated in th	ne abstract.
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
(a brief explanationis recommendable)	•
Although mainly written in an academic and clear language, this articl mistakes. The author should consider punctuation. More often than no	

where a dash is needed. He should also mind the space between two words or between a word

and the punctuation. His use of slashes are sometimes faulty

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(An explanationis recommendable)	
The author uses postmodernism to scrutinize modernism and concludes thave the same goal, expressed in different and apparently contradictory v shows good mastery of the ideology, philosophy, doctrine that span wester European thought.	vays. In so doing he
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
(An explanationis recommendable)	
The body of the work shows the author's mastery of the concepts and ideologic	
of his familiarity and apt use of the studied thinkers' and philosophers' theorie	S.
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5

3

(abrief explanationis recommendable)

versa)

The references are well sorted out, but the author has to automate the presentation of the bibliography by standardizing the space between the lines

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation):

(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The text gives insight into the western thoughts. Mainly focusing Modernism and postmodernism, it revisits the history of colonialism to neocolonialism with the underpinning ideologies that legitimate or counter western hegemony.

It necessitates proof-reading to prune the mistakes to make it more readable.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article is a paramount contribution to literary, philosophical and civilization studies. To be published after minor revision.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute



