
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: 30/11/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 05/12/2017
Manuscript Title: INSECURITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA: A DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1123/17	

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. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title is clear	3
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I suggest summarizing the abstract	2
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> There are few spelling mistakes	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I suggest explaining the study method more thoroughly	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The body of the paper is clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I suggest to deepen conclusions and indicate areas for further research.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I suggest to deepen references	

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):

I suggest explaining the study method more thoroughly.

I also suggest to deepen conclusions and to indicate areas for further research so as to highlight possible alternatives research fields to overcome the limitations of the study.

The paper does not respect the formatting guidelines.

I think the paper needs some further revisions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

