

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:
Date Manuscript Received: January 28 th 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Jan 29 th , 2016
Manuscript Title: The Necessity of Hope as it Pertains to Mankind in the Midst of Suffering and the Implications of our Hope Being in an Omnipotent God who Promises to be with us Always.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0221/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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
The title is too long; it is a paragraph. It should not exceed 10 words	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, but no methods and results.	2
The key words should not be the parts titles, but important concepts	
3. There are a lot of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
There are serious language problems. Proof read the whole article before submitting	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>There is no clear research method</i>	
5. The conclusion is accurate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>There are problems of references and citation styles</i> References should be reconsidered	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Several terms should be explained.
- More attention should be paid to language problems.
- Indentations are missing in the first pages.
- The outline should be deleted

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Such articles are supposed to be double proof-read before being submitted.



