

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 03/10/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 09/10/2017
Manuscript Title: The Governance of Water Use in Northwest Mexico: a Qualitative and Quantitative Based Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 111.09.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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.	4
<i>The title is clear and appropriate to the subject, it mentions the area where the study was carried out and where the specific locality of San Quintin is located where the qualitative analysis and quantification of the use of the water.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The summary clearly details the objectives, methods and results of its study of the Governance of Water Use carried out in that region.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The author clearly explains his methodology used in his research</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodology is detailed and fluent for reader's understanding</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4

<i>His reading is clear and his body is fluent in transmitting the research carried out by the author</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Both the summary and the conclusions are well supported in the content of the research of the author</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are well supported in the subject of the investigation in all the aspects like its problematic and development of its methodology in the analysis made by the author</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good job hopefully continue your research by analyzing the entire area of Northwest Mexico

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thank you for allowing me to participate as a reviewer. These investigations are very important for dissemination in the scientific community in Europe.

