

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: Sep 22 nd , 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Sep 28 th , 2017
Manuscript Title: Interprofessional learning through shadowing in rehabilitations department: -A qualitative study of the student's placement in hospital setting	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1018/17	

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>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	5
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	5

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study methods are explained. But I suggest the chapter of ethical considerations move from conclusion part to methodological.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is clear. Still, I suggest authors give more of their own insights. For example, Introduction part gives many references, but authors' don't do any summarizing.</i>	
<i>Some chapters and subchapters end with the citation. And finishing (sub)chapter with summarizing and giving authors' insights is the requirement of scientific writing.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</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):

The overall quality of the manuscript is good.

Still I suggest moving research ethics to Methodology part and adding summaries to every (sub)chapter.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: