# 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: | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: |
|---|---|
| Manuscript Title: PROMOTING CLINICAL SKILLS ACQUISITION AND PROFICIENCY  USING VIDEO MODELLING AMONG MEDICAL STUDENTS  IN UNIVERSITY OF PORTHARCOURT MEDICAL COLLEGE | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |

## 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.** | **4** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)* **There is no need to put school name in the title. Therefore, delete "IN UNIVERSITY OF PORTHARCOURT MEDICAL COLLEGE" and put "in preclerkship"** **The title is changed as PROMOTING CLINICAL SKILLS ACQUISITION AND PROFICIENCY  USING VIDEO MODELLING AMONG MEDICAL STUDENTS IN PRECLERKSHIP.** | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **4** |
| *(An explanation is recommendable)* | |
| **3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **4** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)* | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **1** |

| | |
|---|---|
| *(An explanation is recommendable)* <br> 1. **The statistical analysis you used cannot support the hypotheses, especially when using "significantly". You need to use more advanced statistical methods to support your hypotheses such as GEE to see the change of time series.** <br> 2. **Table I should present actual numbers of participants.** <br> 3. **The format of tables should present more academic way and consistent throughout.** | |
| **5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.** | **2** |
| *(An explanation is recommendable)* <br> **Since the statistics is not appropriate, it will influence the entire body of the paper.** | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **2** |
| *(An explanation is recommendable)* <br> **There is no way to see whether the discussion or conclusion are accurate when using inappropriate statistical methods. It's hard to convince readers to accept the results of this study.** | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.** <br> *(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)* | **4** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)* | |

## Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|---|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revisions needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | X |
| Reject | |

## Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: