

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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: 2018-12-04	Date Review Report Submitted: 2018-12-11
Manuscript Title: RECENT EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS ON PUBLIC SERVICES TRANSPARENCY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1259/18	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the published version of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	3
<i>The title generally describes the merit of the contribution, but it is not clear from the title or abstract that the location of the issue, that is, which region, the country is covered.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Basically, there is an abstract on the subject, but it is too general, rather descriptive than methodically oriented, and there is no apparent result.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The article is written in solid English at the academic level, without any major clumsiness in expressing and grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The methodology is quite descriptive, the author does not state his own methodological approach,</i>	

<i>the author focuses only on statistical evaluation, where he lists the exact evaluation tools.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The article is descriptive analytical, it has the character of an overview study but it contains interesting data and the content is beneficial, it can identify the added value.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions and summaries are generalizing, but correspond to the presented problem and concept of the author.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The links are relevant, the corresponding issues are only relatively older.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I recommend that the abstraction of the problem solving should be specified (to be defined locally) and that the methodology and results should be specified here briefly. Examination methods would also deserve a brief definition of the author's approach.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

