



Paper: “No Work No Food: An Interpretive Analysis of Paul’s Admonition in 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-13 in the Context of the Discourse on Religion and Poverty”

Corresponding Author: Adewale J. Adelokun

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p117

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Julius Gathogo
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Tayeb Boutbouqalt
University Abdelmalek Essaadi, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Hassan Nandwa
Umma University, Kenya

Reviewer 4: Katica Kulavkova
Macedonian Academy of Sciences & Arts, R. Macedonia

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: Katica KULAVKOVA	
University/Country: Macedonian Academy of Sciences & Arts, R. Macedonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 13.004.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18.04.2020
Manuscript Title: “No Work No Food: An Interpretive Analysis of Paul’s Admonition in 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-13 in the Context of the Discourse on Religion and Poverty”	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is focused on the main topic of the study	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Very good presentation of the main topic	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Maybe to add the etymology of the word/concept of parousia (in Greek alphabet)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Close and illustrated interpretation (textual, comparative, theoretical)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: Dr. Julius Gathogo	Email:
University/Country: Kenyatta University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 13-4-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14-04-2020
Manuscript Title: No Work No Food: An Interpretive Analysis of Paul’s Admonition in 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-13 in the Context of the Discourse on Religion and Poverty	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:Yes/No---- YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	4
<i>Speech marks should be added as follows:</i>	
“No Work No Food”: An Interpretive Analysis of Paul’s Admonition in 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-13 in the Context of the Discourse on Religion and Poverty	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<p><i>Weaknesses, it generalizes that “Ironically, religious people have also been noticed to be happy in the face of poverty...”</i></p> <p>Rather than spot out Africa, and Nigeria in particular. In America and Europe, every religious person is bitter. Some don't read Jurgen Moltmann's books because he is soft on poverty.</p> <p>AGAIN, No Key Words after the abstract</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	MINOR REVISIONS NEEDED
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: