
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: September 19, 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Career Counseling at the Universities: The Bangladesh Scenario	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 148.09.2017	

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.	5
<i>The article is clearly addressing the title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract includes the participants, the type of data collected, how the data were analyzed, and the results. However, the method of analysis needs to be specific rather than the use of "etc."</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a few errors such as leaving off the "s" in a plural and the use of "do" instead of "does" and not including "to" in a phrase such as "enable them to make their vision..."</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>Needs a research question. Be specific about analysis tools and how you obtained your data.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>In defining the six aspects of career counseling considered for this research, the use of “should” indicates an opinion rather than objective discussion.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, there is support for stating the need for career counseling, but the use of the word “felt” is not necessary. Allow the evidence to support rather than the researchers “feelings”.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Not in APA</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):

This sounds like very interesting and necessary research for recognizing changes in career counseling. However, there are a few sections that need revision. Please add your research question and reiterate it in the conclusion to provide the reader with closure regarding how your study was able to address the question. Look at your Methodology again and add details of how you obtained your information. You mention using websites and/or phone conversations in the abstract, but do not convey this at all in the Methodology section. The six aspects of career counseling this study examines (reported after the Methodology) ought to be the result of your literature review and included prior to the methodology section. These aspects may be revisited as the indicators the researchers were looking for in the websites/phone conversations but without the “should” statements, which indicate subjectivity. The point regarding aligning students’ career goals with job market needs is compelling and an indication of how necessary the career services are for this demographic.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

