

# ***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: 9/17/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 9/20/2017
Manuscript Title: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF CLASS REPETITION AND MASS PROMOTION ON STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN ANAMBRA STATE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 15.08.2017	

## **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.

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  <i>My only concern in the abstract is that the data is stated 2004-2005 but within the paper it is stated that there was a three year period of tracking. Also, I returned to the conclusion looking to see if this initial study was then applied to current educational policy in Anambra.</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>A formal proofreading is suggested. I believe most of the grammatical errors are form translating to English. A proofreading would afford the researcher the opportunity to correct verb tense and</i>	

<i>grammatical errors.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There are multiple citations which may require page numbers to support using the work.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

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

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

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

**Thank you for sharing your research. I am curious as to why the paper is focused on data from so long ago. Are you seeing that the results of this study were never applied and the cycle of unearned promotion is having detrimental effects? Perhaps you may consider giving the reader updates as to the state of this problem?**

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

**There are parts of this work that I would accept but then there are sections where I believe page citation needs to be added and a more formal review would benefit the overall read of the paper. I am not sure why there wasn't a more current data base used; perhaps the researcher could only acquire this from the Educational State Department?**

