

Paper: “Universal Laws, Nature Laws, God Laws, Spiritual, Philosophical & Science Laws: Origin, Rationales, Prophesy, and Human Well-Being”

Submitted: 06 February 2024

Accepted: 07 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: M.B. Dastagiri

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p26](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p26)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

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

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Prof. Dr. Julius Gathogo	
University/Country: Kenyatta University & ANCCI University, TX	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/2/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 4/3/2024
Manuscript Title: “Universal Laws, Nature Laws, God Laws, Spiritual, Philosophical & Science Laws: Origin, Rationales, Prophecy, and Human well-being”	
ESJ Manuscript Number:---32.02.2024---m	
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.	3
<i>It appears too long. A main title should be between 5-7 words while the sub-title can go up to 15 words. Titles should be aesthetically appealing.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Abstract has 493 words rather than 150-200 words. That weakens its aesthetic and scholarly beauty. The abstract should simply tell us what the article seeks to unveil, methods used, hypothesis, key findings and theoretical framework.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p>Only a few grammatical errors that can be fixed by the editor. An example is the sentence that reads: "Since many centuries, The Theology and Science is opposite." The sentence is hurt by "the" as in capital "The" within the sentence.</p> <p>Second, some citations are hurt by poor referencing as in the case of (Assar Lindbeck,2013). author should drop Assar and be left with (Lindbeck,2013).</p> <p>Third, there are sentences that are mere sweeping statements with no citations. Take the case of the following statement, whose source or verse in the Bible is not indicated. It reads:</p> <p>"Science has accepted that the fact of universe developed over billions of years. The Bible quote every thing in the universe God created in six days. God created the heavens and the earth out of nothing starting is the starting point of universe, what scientists described as the "Big Bang.""</p> <p>Fourth, some subtitles have more than 5 words. Why not less than 4 words for it to appear classical word? An example is: "A Philosophy of Puzzle of Universal Laws."</p> <p>Fifth, the author keeps on calling it study. Why not research article, as this is not a thesis?</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Largely yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Largely so</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Largely so</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Largely so</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: EIRINI ARTEMI	
University/Country: HELLENIC OPEN UNIVERSITY- GREECE	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/2/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/2/2024
Manuscript Title: Universal Laws, Nature Laws, God Laws, Spiritual, Philosophical & Science Laws: Origin, Rationales, Prophecy, and Human well-being	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.02.2024	
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: 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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[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>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
It should make questions	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some words and the structure of passive voice should be examined again</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do 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.	4
<i>He should use references from the Bible and the patristic Fathers</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: