

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:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 9/14/2017
Manuscript Title: The theory and economics of mars and moon colonization	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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> Title need to be rephrased as it is not reflecting the content of the paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Objectives and methods are not clearly presented in abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Spelling mistakes are many. They are to be corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Study is seem to be based on review of literature. But reported to be meta analysis.	

Following conditions are to be met in order to claim that study adopts meta analysis.	
<p>(1) <i>clearly stated objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies explicit, reproducible methodology</i></p> <p>(2) <i>a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies</i></p> <p>(3) <i>assessment of the validity of the findings of the included studies (e.g. risk of bias)</i></p> <p>(4) <i>systematic presentation, and synthesis, of the characteristics and findings of the included studies</i></p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>Objectives are misleading. The first objective says "To study the theory ad economics of colonization of mars and moon in specific and other planets in general", but deals with findings rather than theory. Also it loosely claims about economics of colonization.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>Few conclusions are not arrived from the study. Keynesian Economics failed in US and Europe, Malthus theory of population failed in many under developed countries and Engels Law of consumption failed in may developed countries and these theories well suited to Mars and Moon.</p> <p>Need explanation on claimed to be failed economic theories (keynesian, Malthus, Engels) how can be successful in mars and moons?</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p>	

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):

To further improve the quality of the paper :

Suggestions:

1

Since the study states that it is based on **meta analysis**, it should fulfill following conditions.

- 1) *clearly stated objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies explicit, reproducible methodology*
- (2) *a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies*
- (3) *assessment of the validity of the findings of the included studies (e.g. risk of bias)*
- (4) *systematic presentation, and synthesis, of the characteristics and findings of the included studies*

2

Spelling mistakes are to be corrected.

3

Few conclusions are not arrived from the study. **Keynesian Economics failed in US and Europe, Malthus theory of population failed in many under developed countries and Engels Law of consumption failed in may developed countries and these theories well suited to Mars and Moon.**

Need explanation on claimed to be failed economic theories (keynesian, Malthus, Engels) how can be successful in mars and moons?

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

