
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!

Date Manuscript Received: 23 Jan	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 25 Jan
Manuscript Title: Evaluation du niveau de développement de compétences des étudiants en Licence3 et Master 1 de sciences physiques des universités de Côte d'Ivoire sur l'oxydoréduction.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0235/16	

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>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Needs thorough restructuring. It is not appearing as an abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <i>The conclusion does not say whether the three hypotheses are confirmed or not.</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</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):

This sheet is to be returned to the author(s) of the manuscript. Please provide reasons for acceptance or rejection as well as any suggestions that you might feel are appropriate for revisions or improvements.

The subject is important and interesting but the introduction is much longer. The introduction involves many authors, but the discussion has almost no authors. Point 4 is too loaded; So must be separated results and discussion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The subject is important and interesting but the introduction is much longer. The introduction involves many authors, but the discussion has almost no authors. Point 4 is too loaded; So must be separated results and discussion.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

