

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: 20 Oct 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 22 Oct 2017
Manuscript Title: THE VALIDITY OF OKUN'S LAW, CASE OF JORDAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 111.10.2017	

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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Good title that is in tune with the Okun model used.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Good but a bit long. Could have fewer words especially NOT MORE THAN ONE paragraph.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Check a few commas and full stops. Otherwise OK.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

Good use of regression model with Okun theory.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Clear but a few punctuations to be made.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Fair and reasonable conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Please put references in alphabetical order.	

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):

Good paper. Just have a single abstract. Correct punctuations and have standardized tables, figures. For references, have them in ascending alphabetical order. Well written and can be published after some corrections. For conclusion part, put It is suggested rather than recommended. Write GDP without brackets instead of Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Good paper. Just have a single abstract. Correct punctuations and have standardized tables, figures. For references, have them in ascending alphabetical order. Well written and can be published after some corrections.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

