

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!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 29.11.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 04.12.2017
Manuscript Title:	
Food waste factors of urban Albanian consumers-a multinomial econometric approach	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1284/17	

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.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> A full compliance between title and contents exists	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> From the abstract I can understand well major topics for discussion, methods used and main results. A longer abstract could be more informative.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> I was not able to identify grammatical or spelling errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Methods are explained quite explicitly, but also sources for further explanation of methods are indicated.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> To my best understanding of the research material and method used there are no errors and analysis is correct.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Yes, all conclusions are drawn based on the study results and findings	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i> References seem to be quite appropriate, internet references need to have the retrieved date	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

--