

Paper: “Vicious and Good/Virtuous Relationships in the Teachings of the Church Fathers”

Submitted: 25 February 2022

Accepted: 06 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Eirini Artemi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tayeb Boutbouqalt
University Abdelmalek Essaadi, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Emeka C. Ekeke
University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: UAE/MOROCCO	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: VICIOUS AND GOOD/VIRTUOUS RELATIONSHIPS IN THE TEACHINGS OF THE CHURCH FATHERS	
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.	3
The wording of the title is a bit vague but adequate	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The summary is quite clear but the methods are not sufficiently well explained	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Insubstantial	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Good enough</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Good enough</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Quite well</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
References must follow APA style	

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 dates of birth and death (Born -Died) of historical figures must be indicated, examples: John Chrysostom (347-407), Gregory of Nyssa, (332-395)...*

- *References must follow APA style.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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. Emeka C. Ekeke	
University/Country: University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: March 03, 2022
Manuscript Title: VICIOUS AND GOOD/VIRTUOUS RELATIONSHIPS IN THE TEACHINGS OF THE CHURCH FATHERS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0322/22	
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 - Yes	
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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is very unclear.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The author did not carefully include the methods and the result in the abstract. He just ended it with questions.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> . Few errors which should be corrected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> . Methods are not shown at all.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> . The results are clumsy.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> . The conclusions are supported by the content but the content is too clumsy and unnecessarily large.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> . There are many omitted references the author will need to provide. The author should also follow the journal's referencing style.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest that the author should divide this work into two different parts with different titles. It is too large and clumsy for proper reading and understanding. The narration in the work is not cohesive. It should be clear whether you are writing about the Roman Era or Byzantine period. If possible, there should be periodization to enable a historian and others follow your line of thought.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: