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: ***April, 13th 2018***	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: ***April, 22th 2018***
Manuscript Title: ***Homelessness and unemployment during the economic recession: the case of the city of Girona***	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ***04120/18***	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	***5***
(a brief explanation is recommendable) ***The title includes the two variables that have been analyzed and places them in their study context***	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	***4***
(An explanation is recommendable) ***The first sentence of the abstract makes sense in the body of the paper, because it is developed later. It doesn't happen the same in the abstract. Starting directly with the objective of the study (without this sentence) or explaining (after this sentence) that the study is referred to a specific structural variable (unemployment) would be recommendable.***	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
(a brief explanation is recommendable) ***I have not appreciated them, but my English level is insufficient to assess this point***	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	***5***
(An explanation is recommendable) ***The criteria for the selection of participants, the sources of data of the two variables and the statistical analysis are clearly explained. Perhaps it would help the reader's understanding some reference to number of participants in the section referred to them (maximum and minimum, for example or an indication about the subsequent explanation in the procedure section).***	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	***4***
(An explanation is recommendable) ***In general, the paper is clear and consistent.*** ***I think it is necessary to review the last sentence of the first paragraph of the discussion because it seems contradictory with the results.*** ***There is a typographic mistake in the first paragraph of results: ED / DE***	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	***5***
(An explanation is recommendable) ***This section shows a knowledge of the subject that goes beyond simple data analysis. This fact allows authors to justify the data selection and processing and to make consistent interpretations of the results, connecting them with the praxis of social and educational intervention in the territory analyzed.***	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. *(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)*	***5***
(a brief explanation is recommendable) ***I didn't find any mistake related to this aspect***	

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):

In general, the paper is clear and consistent. Suggestions:

- ***Revising the first sentence of the abstract to connect it with the text or to remove it.***

- *I think it is necessary to review the last sentence of the first paragraph of the discussion because it seems contradictory with the results.*
- *There is a typographic mistake in the first paragraph of results: ED / DE*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I think it's a simple but suggesting study.