



Manuscript: “Sustainability of the Nigerian Environmental Resources Conservation and Management: Interrogating the Principles of Conservation in Biblical Christian Perspective”

Submitted: 09 June 2020

Accepted: 18 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Rimamsikwe Habila Kitause

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p51

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Clifford Terhide Gbasha
Federal University of Kashere, Gombe State Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Julius Gathogo
University of South Africa, South Africa

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: Julius Gathogo	
University/Country: Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 July 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 July 2020
Manuscript Title: Sustainability of Environmental Resources Conservation and Management: The Religious Perspective in Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 83.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ 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.	3
<i>The title on “Sustainability of Environmental Resources Conservation and Management: The Religious Perspective in Nigeria” is OK although conservation and sustainability are more or less synonymous. The candidate can change it or rephrase the two nouns</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The author needed to tell us the method he or she utilizes and the theoretical framework that informs this write-up. Also needed to be sharper in telling us what the article sets out to do, or the problem it seeks to unveil.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Little that require editorial review</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
As noted, the author can do a sentence on methodology in the abstract and the section he calls Conceptual clarification. In other words, how does he gather the materials therein. How does he unveil his or her concerns or problem being unveiled?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
Some errors are there for corrections e.g “ Environmental Resources Challenges in Nigeria ” as a subtitle needs correction and remove one ‘s’	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Conclusion has to start by telling us what the author set out to do, summarize the findings of the article, though he/she calls it “paper” rather than article, then make proposals for way forward.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>The author will need to read and refer to the following article on Environmental Management so as to fill in some missing gaps. That is, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1017-04992013000200004 In other words, it is not enough to talk of the Nigerian way of conserving environment. S/he needs to compare with Kenya and other African nations, as well. Two to 3 sentences will do.</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):

Visit web and align your paper to this:

http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1017-04992013000200004

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 7 Jul 2020, 13:41	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 Jul 2020, 10:04
Manuscript Title: Sustainability Of Environmental Resources Conservation And Management: The Religious Perspective In Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 83.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The topic is topical, it is important because the position of religion is often neglected in the discourses around environmental studies etc. however the authors do not connect the topic with content. It is poorly presented	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract does not cover the topic, for example, what role does religion play in either maintain or destroying the environment? The abstract is vague and incomplete and without results, I see only methods	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I advise that an English editor goes through the work for grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> no adequate explanation of the methodology used in the study- descriptive and analytical is not enough for such a study	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This body of work lacks balance of religion and her role in environment. We have several world religions, what does Hindu, Islam, Buddhist and Christianity say about environment? The study sounds like a biblical Christian understanding of what environment should look like	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The presentation is very sloppy and inconsistent with topic	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the references are adequate but have not been used properly	

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 topic is topical and very novel, however the content and topic do not flow together, there is a total disconnect from the two. You have to go through my comments and rework the paper and give the roles of religion in either destroying of sustaining the environment.

The work will read well if you go through the comments and make corrections

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work should be sent to the authors for reworking and subsequently submit for publication