REVIEW HISTORY

LLC *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2019*

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: LLC 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.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Wafaa Abdel-Kader Mostafa Hussein	Email: wafaanagy@yahoo.com
Date Manuscript Received: January, 30, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: Februery,3, 2020
Manuscript Title: **The Prologue and its Introduction to Ralph Ellison's Existentialist Philosophical Concept about Black People Invisibility in *The Invisible Man***	
LLC Manuscript Number:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the published version of the paper:**Ye**s/No	

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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) **-The author has built the argument on Descartes' philosophy without mentioning the philosopher in the title.** **-While the author states in the title that Ralph Ellison has an "Existentialist Philosophical concept", the paper does not analyize the theoretical background of the supposed philosophical concept.**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) - Repetition of some expressions (e.g. "Thanks to" is repeated ten times" to refer to the relationship of cause and effect.) - lack of accuracy in using cohesive ties and connectors - Grammatical errors (e.g. using "but also" four times inaccurately.) - Lack of accuracy in using punctuations, possessive pronouns, and articles - Stylistic errors (word choice) - Few typographical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**

(Please insert your comments)

- **Excessive repetition of the same ideas and expressions**
- **Over generalization**
- **Lack of a coherent theoretical framework**

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**

(Please insert your comments)

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**

(Please insert your comments)

- **Although the bibliography contains a considerable number of references, the author relies mainly on limited sources.**

- **Extensive use of long quotations**

- **Inaccurate in text citation**

-   **Some quotations lack documentation.**

- **The bibliography needs revision.**

-**The author does not use a consistent documentation style. (MLA style is recommended)**

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: