

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 team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 07.02.2018.	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 10.02.2018.
Manuscript Title: Corporate Governance in Jordan, Boardroom Diversity: A Critical Review of Literature	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 96.02.2018	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title of the paper is clear and well-focused, adequate to the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Aims and goals of the paper are well-defined, the mission of the research is adequately emphasized by the author(s), however the contribution of the study should be also stressed. Moreover, it is worth to note that no real best practice is presented in the paper.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
Several spelling/typing mistakes and grammatical errors can be found in the paper. A professional proofread could enhance the readability of the text.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The article is based on a simple literature review, no special analysis was conducted.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The body of the paper is acceptable, the logic of the author(s) can be easily followed. However, there is no “critical review” or analysis in the paper, comparison of the literature sources are missing (regarding the key findings, methods, results, assumptions, etc.), indeed in its current state, only the	

short summary of literature sources was elaborated.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion section never moves beyond the descriptive level and therefore fails to contribute to the debate on the topic.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	5
Quotation and referencing meet the formal requirements.	

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):

The paper deals with an actual and interesting topic. An adequate descriptive section of current literature is lacking. In particular, the literature review should be more to the point, the critical analysis needs a systematic review of previous findings and results, own contributions should be more emphasized. The paper needs a thorough review and rewrite by English speaker/writer. Tenses, verbiage, use of words, and sentence structure make it hard to discern what is being stated. Quotation and referencing meet the formal requirements.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

