

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: 28/10/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Practice of Corporate Social Responsibility in Moroccan Companies: an Exploratory Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number:1146/17	

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.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Depersonalize the study by change words such as “we, our etc with words such the researchers, or study	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Explain whether you used a sample and technique used in selecting it or whether it was a census of	

the entire population	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2.5
The paper has very few cited works. Ensure to uniform system of the citation correctly	

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): Carry out the corrections suggested in the evaluation form.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper should be accepted for publication after the corrections suggested in the evaluation form are carried out.