

Paper: “Politics of Secularism in Ethiopia: Repression or Co-option towards the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido Church?”

Submitted: 22 March 2024

Accepted: 11 April 2024

Published: 30 April 2024

Corresponding Author: Dereje Melese Liyew

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n11p33](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n11p33)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eirini Artemi
Hellenic Open University, Greece

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

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I have marked it as tracked changes that a title cannot do with abbreviations unless it is something known by all. See attachment

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It is OK minus grammatical errors, punctuations and so on. It needs thorough scrutiny of tenses and grammar in general

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, that is its only weakness. Otherwise, its good stuff

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Largely fine

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes, errors, typos and grammar are its main weakness. Otherwise, the world needs to learn about Ethiopia and her unique history

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Its too long. It introduces new information rather than retelling us what it intended to achieve, then summarise the research article, and then give us its findings, and a way forward or recommendations. It could do better.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Fine

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Find attachment somewhere

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title summarizes with excellent way the context of the paper

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, it does. The reader knows what is going to read

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes he gives examples

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes. He manages to do si

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

he could have some more

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
