

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 1 March 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title:  Competition and food intake: A laboratory study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---5.03.2018	

## Evaluation Criteria:

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  <i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> <b>The abstract does not clearly state the aim of the paper. This information is given in another part of the paper, and it should be included in the abstract.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  <i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i> <b>There are some minor mistakes in punctuation.</b> <b>Wrong question mark in English (p. 17):</b> <b>¿Do you suffer from any of these diseases?</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b> <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	No—see comments.
Source Holt (2002) is not in the body of the paper. Source Buckert et al (2015) is missing in the References.	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>x</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**The lay-out of the title page does not correspond to the ESJ template.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

