Paper: "**A Quadratic and Linear Metric Characterizing the Sampling Design with Fixed Sample Size Considered From a Geometric Viewpoint**"

Corresponding Author: Pierpaolo Angelini

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Rafiqul Islam, BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Reviewer 2: Gladys Charles-Ogan, University of Port Harcourt/Nigeria

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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: **Gladys I. Charles-Ogan (PhD)**	
University/Country: **University of Port Harcourt/Nigeria**	
Date Manuscript Received: **26/04/2020**	Date Review Report Submitted: **05/05/2020**
Manuscript Title: **A quadratic and linear metric characterizing the sampling design with fixed sample size considered from a geometric viewpoint**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0488/20**	
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 "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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**
(Please insert your comments) **Yes** **The title of the article is very adequate to the content.**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**4**

results.	
(Please insert your comments) **The abstract captures the object, method and result as expressed in the paper.**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **The writers gave sufficient details on the method which was sufficiently applied to the object thereby giving desired result.**	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **No errors were found in the body of the paper except minor alignment error in section 4.**	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
(Please insert your comments) **The conclusion is accurate and very well supports the content of the paper.**	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) **References are comprehensive and appropriate but very few recent ones.**	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Check the comments in RED colour.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Check the comments in RED colour.