

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: 2018-04-11	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 2018-04-18
Manuscript Title: Significance of Applying Advanced Managerial Accounting Techniques in Decision Support System in SMEs in Jordan: An Empirical Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0491/18	

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.	3
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i> The title is not clear as it does not indicate clearly what the research is investigating. I propose it to be as follows: “An Empirical Analysis of Advanced Managerial Accounting Techniques and Decision Support System in Small and Medium Enterprises in Jordan”	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> The abstract should be logically presented in the following order: state the problem of the study, the objectives, research design, population of interest, sample and sampling technique, data collection, data analysis, findings, conclusion and recommendations.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i> The entire document requires streamlining	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> The methodology used is not clear at all	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> The explanations of the findings are not in line with the presented results in the tables. The operationalization of the variables is not stated. Researcher is using the beta coefficient to determine the significance of the independent variables on the dependent variables which is wrong. Instead, the researcher should use the t – tests or the sig. (p – values) to determine the significance.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> The conclusion is not based on study findings	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> There is need to follow current APA style of referencing	

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 authors need to revise the entire document based on the comments stated above. They should clearly bring out the advanced managerial accounting techniques they are referring to.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

