
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: 22-10 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:23-10 2017
Manuscript Title: EVALUATION OF EUROFIT TEST RESULTS OF 11-17-YEAR-OLD MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS IN KOSOVO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1105/17	

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.	2
<i>It is more a comparative analysis rather than an evaluation</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>The language can be more rigid and precise, sentences shorter and stronger It has to go through an extra critical language check</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>The methodology has to be elaborated together with Eurofit – which is hardly explained</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>I don't know what this means. But I do believe that the paper is of interest and has the potential to be published.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Once again the authors have to be aware if it is an evaluation or comparison. This lack of awareness is confusion throughout the paper and is also reflected in the conclusion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is 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: