



Paper: “Worship and Sacrifice in Isaiah 1:10-17 A Textual Study and Application to the Contemporary Church and Society”

Corresponding Author: Israel Odukogbe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tayeb Boutbouqalt
University Abdelmalek Essaadi, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.09.2020

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: Dr. Tayeb BOUTBOUQALT	
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University - Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: WORSHIP AND SACRIFICE IN ISAIAH 1:10-17 - A TEXTUAL STUDY AND APPLICATION TO THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH AND SOCIETY	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
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	

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
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

Good enough	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Overall good	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Good enough	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
Good enough	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The “APPLICATION TO THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH AND SOCIETY” deserves more development...</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>It's OK.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The “APPLICATION TO THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH AND SOCIETY” deserves more development...

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: