

Manuscript: “A Critical Study of Abba Ho Patēr in Romans 8:15 in the New Revised Asante Twi Version (2018)”

Submitted: 26 March 2021

Accepted: 04 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Asamoah Emmanuel Foster

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n16p59

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Humphrey M Waweru, Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Jonathan Kuwornu-Adjaottor, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

Reviewer 3: Dr. Driss Bouyahya, Moulay Ismail University, Meknes, Morocco

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. Humphrey M Waweru	
University/Country: KENYATTA UNIVERSITY- KENYA	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 th April 2021.
Manuscript Title: A CRITICAL STUDY OF ABBA HO PATĒR IN ROMANS 8:15 IN THE NEW REVISED ASANTE TWI VERSION (2018)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25.04.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The year may not be necessary at the title. The words studied will not change with years.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>A bit of sharpening the results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper has grammatical errors proof reading is expected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Enhance the mother hermeneutics by reading others like Sanneh	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Few errors which can be sorted out.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is ok.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Use the links provided to improve your work.</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 authors will do the minor corrections.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 23 April, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: A CRITICAL STUDY OF ABBA HO PATĒR IN ROMANS 8:15 IN THE NEW REVISED ASANTE TWI VERSION (2018)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25.04.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Please read through the paper. Delete the cancelled red portions.

Darken the green parts.

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. Driss Bouyahya	
University/Country: Moulay Ismail University, Meknes Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: April 24 th , 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: May 1 st , 2021
Manuscript Title: A CRITICAL STUDY OF ABBA HO PATĒR IN ROMANS 8:15 IN THE NEW REVISED ASANTE TWI VERSION (2018)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0425/21	
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.	3

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
The abstract should be reconsidered because it is just made of parts from the text. It should state the rationale, methodology, and the finding of the study	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Some minor punctuation, grammar, and structure errors. The errors are highlighted in red	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<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.	2
The author has to be consistent in the documentation style. Sometimes he/she uses APA, and others, there is MLA. See the reference list	

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):

Please Avoid repeating the same paragraphs. See the text; they are highlighted in **BLUE**