

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: 15.01	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 17.01
Manuscript Title: L'apport Du Marché De Capitaux Au Financement Des PME Marocaines	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 144.12.2017	

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.	5
<i>The title is clear, direct and intriguing the reader to discover more, both from a theoretical audience and a professional or industrial one</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
Too shot, generic, and add nothing to the title, explaining not a what-how methodology, neither reasons of interest or results. Must be rewritten in a very educated way.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The text is basically clean (French language revision is positive)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>This is a purely descriptive paper, with no research content, but for some quantitative data gathering. I strongly advise to add the methodology chapter to explain this fact, nevertheless to add a mention in the abstract.</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>Yes it is clear and clean, even though betraying the great expectations of the title, it is too much compilative.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>They are basic; authors need to clearly state result linking them with the expected outcomes (to be done) and define limitations and future improvements.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	3
<i>Poor; too few, a bit messy, to be reviewed both the quality and the quantity of them and the APA format of them, including retrieving date of the web sources.</i>	

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 working methodology is still too poor, it must be reviewed, I do suggest to use web sources to be sure to respect the minimum international standards, to review the abstract and state clearly expected outcomes and results, limitations and improvements and most of all, the methodology. The topic is engaging.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: