

# *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: 9 Jan 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 15 Jan 2018
Manuscript Title: <b>Aggression Dimensions in People with Autism According to Some Variables</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

## 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>	<b>3</b>
<i>The term "Some variables" is vague. I would suggest being clearer and more specific The term "people" is vague. Be specific considering the sample used</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>It would be useful to double check grammar mistakes It is not clear whether the scale was fully developed from scratch of adapted. No information about psychometric properties and/or validity/reliability information of the scale (just mention briefly here)</i>	
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There are quite a few grammar mistakes which you need to be careful with. This could be</i>	

<i>observed throughout the manuscript in different sections.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>I wonder why the authors used the DSM-IV and not the latest version? The authors may need to clarify this.</i></p> <p>Sometimes the authors cite that the sample size as 82 and sometimes it was 108. There is no explanation about this whatsoever</p>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>At the end of the introduction I would recommend clarify and summarise the gaps found in the literature which lay the foundations of the present study.</i></p> <p><i>In this same section (i.e., I recommend this in the last paragraph) I would also encourage authors to include either the research questions and/or the study aims.</i></p> <p><i>The symbols of central tendency measures are not presented -within text-, in the appropriate format as per APA manual.</i></p> <p><i>In some cases the authors describe 108 participants whereas in other cases they mention 82. There must be a clear explanation whenever you are talking about different sample -if needed.</i></p> <p>The format hen making reference to the Tables is not uniform. Double check.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>Whilst the main finding are presented, the potential explanations offered by the authors is not supported by empirical evidence -making the arguments weak.</p> <p>The main findings must be contrasted with previous studies. This is observed to a minor extent. Needs improvement.</p> <p>There are facts not supported by empirical evidence (refences not cited)</p> <p>I would encourage the authors to offer a set of clear contributions of this study. How do the findings, contribute at methodological, theoretical and practical level? The contribution is not clear.</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>There are minor mistakes in the use of the APA style. Check in-text ciattions, referencs, quotations, tables fomateed according to APA.</i></p>	
<p>The references are comprehensive and according to the APA, however in the discussion/conclusion section the references were a little bit limited.</p>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<input type="checkbox"/>

Return for major revision and resubmission	20
Reject	

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

Please follow the above-mentioned feedback.

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

This manuscript is valuable; however it needs major revisions.

