
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: 13 December 2017 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 13 December 2017 |
| Manuscript Title: <i>Conjuring Trauma with (Self)Derision: The African and African-American Epistolary Fiction</i> | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |

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. | 4 |
| <i>The title is in line with the main content of the papers and the objective stated in the introduction</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>Though well written, the abstraction makes no explicit mention of the cause and the outcome of the narrators' confession letters. Only the methods they use are clearly stressed. Besides, the author should clearly state the purpose of his study.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| article. | |
| <i>The text is written in a very simple and clear English, which makes its reading and understanding quite easy. However, there are few mistakes, awkward sentences and commas missing. I have underlined all this in yellow colour and suggested few corrections in bold characters.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | |
| The text contains no errors | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>Yes, the author has successfully demonstrated that derision of oneself and the super structure that nurtures gender injustice is an efficient tool the three women-narrators use to transcend their suffering and reconcile with themselves</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>The references are relevant to the study and comprehensive, but the author should check the guidelines of the journal to comply with the presentation of books and articles.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revisions needed | ➤ |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is interesting and is a major contribution to psycho-feminist analysis and to the fight for the liberation of traumatized women in general, especially as it deals with women belonging to different cultural realities (African and African-American)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

