

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: 5 th November 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 7 th November 2017
Manuscript Title: International Trading Prices of India's Oilseed Crops: Growth Rates, Elasticity's & Foreign Trade Policy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 72.11.17	

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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Check the term Elasticity's – should read elasticity or elasticities	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Clear but it was full of typos – I did my best to make it legible	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> No – there are a lot of typos – I have made a number of amendments but there are too many- this paper is desperately in need of proof reading	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

Yes. Formulas are clear too.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Figures presented look fine. Good use of tables and figures too.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes. The conclusions and recommendations emerge from the findings of the study	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> References used are slightly dated. I suggest that the authors include some more recent references (2014-2017)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	*
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is an interesting paper that needs proof reading and the inclusion of some recent articles. After this I think it has the necessary attributes for publication in ESJ.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Same as above. I am attaching the paper with some track changes and comments for the authors' perusal