

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHST-016

**Title: COMMERCIALIZATION OF RELIGIOUS OBJECTS AMONGST
PENTECOSTAL CHURCHES IN NIGERIA: A CRITIQUE**

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- Lastri Wahyuni Manurung

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Comments:

This manuscript addresses a highly relevant and sensitive issue concerning the commercialization of religious objects in Pentecostal churches in Nigeria. The topic is significant within religious studies, sociology, and ethics, and the manuscript demonstrates a strong critical stance supported by historical and contextual discussions.

However, the paper requires **major revision** before it is suitable for publication. The key concerns include:

- Lack of clear methodological framework
- Overly narrative and anecdotal approach
- Strong subjective tone in several sections
- Numerous grammatical and typographical errors
- Weak academic structure and coherence
- Limited engagement with recent scholarly literature

Specific Comments (Line-by-Line Improvements):

Abstract

- **Line 6–12:** Sentence structure is too long; break into shorter sentences for clarity.
- **Line 13–15:** “exploitation of vulnerable worshippers...” → good point, but needs a more academic tone (avoid emotional phrasing).

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Line 20–24:** Recommendations are too general; make them more specific and academically grounded.

Introduction

- **Line 31–33:** “It has made the institution to deviate...” → grammatically incorrect; revise to “It has caused the institution to deviate...”
- **Line 34–46:** Use of personal narrative (I. Okoye story) is too informal and not suitable for academic writing.
- **Line 35:** “personal Communication” → should be “personal communication”
- **Line 36–37:** “petty worker” → unclear term; needs clarification.
- **Line 41–44:** Sentence too long and poorly structured.
- **Line 46:** “God eventually decided her fate” → too subjective; rephrase in neutral academic tone.
- **Line 47–48:** “leveling allegation on their Clients” → incorrect capitalization and wording.
- **Line 49:** “affluence gospels” → should be “affluence gospel” or “prosperity gospel”.
- **Line 54–56:** First-person expression “I found...” should be avoided in academic writing.

Problem Statement & Methodology

- **Line 57–60:** Strong claims (“making money”, “take advantage”) need academic support or citation.
- **Line 60–61:** Historical reference (middle ages) is good but requires proper citation formatting.
- **Line 62:** “soul aim” → should be “sole aim”.
- **Line 66–68:** Sentence too long and unclear.
- **Line 76–82:** Methodology is vague and poorly structured:
 - No clear research design
 - No explanation of data analysis
 - Sources are listed but not justified

Historical Section

- **Line 84–104:** Good historical background, but:
 - Needs proper referencing style
 - Several grammatical errors
- **Line 93:** “Simony the practice...” → missing punctuation.
- **Line 99:** “suffer death for his or her sins” → unclear phrasing.

Religious Objects Section

- **Line 116–117:** Sentence incomplete; needs revision.
- **Line 121–122:** Grammar error (“set the anointed person or object apart or most holy”).

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Line 128–131:** Claims about healing poverty require stronger academic support.
- **Line 133–137:** Overgeneralization; lacks citation.

African Worldview Section

- **Line 164–165:** “valves” → should be “values”.
- **Line 170–175:** Repetition and unclear phrasing.
- **Line 176–180:** Overgeneralization linking Pentecostalism and African Traditional Religion—needs careful academic justification.

Reasons Section

- **Line 182–185:** Poor sentence structure; needs rewriting.
- **Line 187–189:** “salvation is not cheap...” → controversial claim; must be critically discussed, not stated as fact.
- **Line 194–196:** “private jet...” → requires evidence or citation.

Effects Section

- **Line 274–290:** Anecdotal story (vehicle case) is too informal and lacks verification.
- **Line 287–288:** Example of drinking olive oil—needs citation or removal.
- **Line 292–296:** “demigod” explanation is irrelevant and poorly integrated.

Discussion Section

- **Line 300–311:** Strong and well-written; one of the best parts of the paper.
- **Line 315–330:** Good argument, but sentences are too long; improve readability.
- **Line 331–343:** Repetition of earlier ideas.

Conclusion

- **Line 362–371:** Grammar issues:
 - “is deviation” → “is a deviation”
 - “dints the image” → incorrect expression
- Conclusion is too descriptive and repetitive.

Recommendations

- **Line 377–381:** Sentence too long; needs simplification.
- **Line 382–386:** Good idea but vague; needs specificity.
- **Line 388–389:** “stake holders” → should be “stakeholders”.