

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: Sept. 19 th , 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Sept. 20 th , 2017
Manuscript Title: AN OVERVIEW OF GOOD FAITH AS A PRINCIPLE OF CONTRACTUAL INTERPRETATION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 108.09.2017	

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.

<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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> A mention to the context of reference is needed. I would suggest adding a subtitle with more information regarding on what is dealing with the text. For instance, “ A comparative approach between European civil and common law, or “Special reference to the Albanian law”In order to make the article approach more clear and attractive to readers I would suggest to consider a controversial aspect of such principle, if there is...	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <p style="text-align: center;">The main research objective is not included, In fact it is been said that “The purpose of this paper is to analyze the principle of good faith, shedding light on the concept and the impact of this principle on various legal systems, civil and customary traditions.”, but this is not reflected in the text. The scope is too general and to descriptive.</p>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes, there are. For instance, page 5 “principle of god faith”, “The Roman law”, “the concept of Equity”. A review is highly recommended.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> No, they are not explained. It would be useful to make an overview to some cases and jurisprudence to analyze the interpretation of such principle. Moreover, it is not clear why Albanian law is considered as a particular example. It is not clear if the author pretends to do a comparative analysis and on which purpose?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The paper remains descriptive without a deeper analysis. It remains unclear which are the main aims of the research, which are the questions to resolve	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusions don't constitute a critical appraisal, they are just a summary	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The references are insufficient to base the different assertions made by the author. Indeed some of the affirmations and information have not references. In general, the references used are poor and do not provide the foundation to the author's main arguments. I suggest enriching the paper with more doctrine, jurisprudence and legal references, if the author wants to offer a comparative approach on the topic.	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

