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: 16/12/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 20/12/2017
Manuscript Title: **Food waste factors of urban Albanian consumers-a multinomial econometric approach**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 84.12.2017-1	

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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
(abrief explanationis recommendable)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(abrief explanationis recommendable)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
(abrief explanationis recommendable)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(abrief explanationis recommendable)	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
(abrief explanationis recommendable)	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
(abrief explanationis recommendable) **Conclusions are too wide. It would be useful to separate discussion from conclusions.**	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
(a brief explanationis recommendable)	

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):

1) research problem as the sybtitle is mentioned 2 times (p. 2)

2) such sentences as "It is <u>for sure</u> very interesting", "this phenomenon is <u>for sure</u> much broader" (p. 2) are not scientific, in my opinion, because there is no any "sure" in the science – everything has to be proved. I suggest to avoid such sentences in the text of the article.

3) hypotheses: may be, to put them after some at least brief argumentation, why such hypotheses are in mind? For instance, to put "Findings of previous research…" (p. 3) before hypotheses, as the argumentation for them. By the way, what is this "previous research"? It has to be reference here.

4) hypotheses are too wide and look like results of the research

5) "We use econometric modeling to achieve the research objectives´(p. 6). I can see just the research goal on the page 2, not any objectives – so, I cannot know the objectives of this research. Please, be correct and use something one in the text: "goal" or "objectives".

6) Table 1: there are no titles for 3 table's columns. What is the criterion for separating factors for these 3 groups? If it is just a list of factors, why the table is needed for this?

7) "**Loking** by table rows…" (p. 14) – it has to be "looking"

8) "The study reveals that variable buy more than needed itself has…" (p. 17) – the name of variable - buy more than needed, in this case - has to be in other font's style or underlined.

9) It is not clear enough, why the authors needed to investigate both factors "food discarded per day" and "food discarded per week". It is logically that those who have many food losses per day, have accordingly more food losses per week, and factors here are the same – not depending on how we calculate: per day and per week.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: