
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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:25-08-2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 18-09-2017
Manuscript Title: The Theory and Economics of MARS and MOON Colonization	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0876/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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.	04
<i>(abrief explanatonis recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	03
<i>(abrief explanatonis recommendable)</i>	
Need further improvement as methodology and results have not been discussed with clarity and structure of paper also needs improvement as per requirement of ESJ.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	04
<i>(abrief explanatonis recommendable)</i>	
<i>Need corrections specified in bold underlined red colour.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	03
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> <i>It needs further clarity.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	03
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> It is not clear and needs restructuring.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	03
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	04
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: