

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: 11/5/18	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 21/05/18
Manuscript Title: Family Concept in Shakespeare' Titus Andronicus	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0591/18	

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
The content of the article is not in conformity with the title. The author has shown more aspects of civilization than those of literary criticism.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
The objectives and results of the corpus analyses are missing.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
Some grammatical errors must be corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
No theoretical preliminary has been accounted for in the study.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
Some aspects of errors have to be corrected.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Not totally.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
The author must add the corpus to his reference list	

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):

The abstract of the article must be revised. The related keywords must be put below it. The author must include the translated keywords of the abstract in the French version. The literary theory adopted should be accounted for briefly in the work. The content of the article shows that the author has made confusion between civilization (which deals with reality) and literary criticism (which focuses on fiction). Therefore, the subtitles dealt with must be revised and the analyses should be carried out in the context of the fictitious play.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I would like to thank the editors for having given me the opportunity to revise this article.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

