

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended 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!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Scott-Webber	
Date Manuscript Received: 11.30.2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.4.2018
Manuscript Title: Factors Affecting Implementation and Compliance with Housing Standards for Sustainable Housing Delivery in Bayelsa State, Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1078/18	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the published version of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this	4

article.	
<i>In order to assist this author I have used Track Changes to illustrate how much work actually needed to be done to correct all of the mistakes both grammatical as well as lack of use of APA style formatting. I am giving it a 4 due to my extensive editing.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Much better than the first submission.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>See my notes in #3</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Should generate a clear connection between findings and conclusion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Again this author did not follow APA style and I worked to fix these.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed [IF this author uses my corrected work!]	x
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Before resubmitting anything back for a review. Make sure you have gone through each of the critiques and understand the level of work required before you resubmit, and then DO them ALL. I had the time to do these extensive, extensive edits. But items as small as where periods should be, spaces between words, etc. These should have ALL been cleaned up. It's important work, so I chose to help where I can, but normally I would send a manuscript back to the journal with just saying, "Didn't do a thing to address edit requirements!"

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

