

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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: 6/Feb./ 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Corporate Governance in Jordan, Boardroom Diversity: A Critical Review of Literature	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 96.02.2018	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each 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>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is inconsistent verb tenses. In academic writing, it is important to use verb tenses consistently throughout a paper. In your paper p. 2 you used the past tense “Bantel and Jackson (1989) proposed” but in the next page you used the present tense “Graham and Harvey (2002) say”. ● In p. 4. moreover, many studies are → Moreover 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	-
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
It's a critical review paper.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4	
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>		
<p>1. There is a need to add some of references to some of paragraphs, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additionally, it is also noteworthy to know who don't have a higher education. • The separation between management and ownership in the organization increase may cause a conflict among them. • The variables of board diversity were consist of.....on CSR disclosure in Jordan. • In p. 4 you should put the reference (citation) between brackets (Young and Thyl, 2009). <p>2. The author has not mention to the Jordanian corporate governance code 2009 and 2017.</p> <p>3. Add some of studies talking about CG in Jordan.</p>		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>		
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3	
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of sources are not available in references list. 1. (Barker and Mueller, 2002) in p.2 2. Graham and Harvey (2002) in p. 3 		
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>		

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. The author should mention to the “Jordanian corporate governance code 2009 and 2017.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: