
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: 23/08/2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 25/08/2018
Manuscript Title: Comites villageois et problématique de la gestion des points d'eau dans l'arrondissement de Bayangam en pays Bamiléké (Ouest-Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0908/18	

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. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	4
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Some grammatical and spelling errors that must be corrected	2
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	4

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> Some errors in the numbering of titles. The discussion was not conducted because no author is mentioned in the discussion points.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	2
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> References deserve to be expanded	

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):

A proofreading of the document deserves to be done for the correction of spelling and grammatical errors. Also, the discussion deserves to be made.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

A proofreading of the document deserves to be done for the correction of spelling and grammatical errors. Also, the discussion deserves to be made.

