

**Paper: “Possibility to Identify Bullets and other Components of the Cartridges by Consideration on Barrels and Projectiles Types”**

**Submitted: 11 July 2022**

**Accepted: 19 September 2022**

**Published: 30 September 2022**

Corresponding Author: Giorgi Dzindzibadze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p47](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p47)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olusola Karimu

Adekunle Ajasin University, Ondo State, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Waliyullahi Damilola Abimbola

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 14 <sup>th</sup> July, 2022.	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 <sup>th</sup> July, 2022.
<b>Manuscript Title: Possibility to identify projectiles and other components of the cartridges by consideration on barrels and projectiles types.</b>	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number: 0742/22.</b>	
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	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	
<i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the work. However, will suggest the author simplify to make it less nebulous, for simplicity sake.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results..</b>	Yes,
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> methods and results of its findings	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are insignificant.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	Yes
<i>The study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	YES
<i>The results do not contain errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	YES
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	YES
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

**Overall Recommendations** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: OLUSOLA KARIMU	
University/Country: Adekunle Ajasin University, Ondo State, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/19/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/28/22
Manuscript Title: Possibility to identify projectiles and other components of the cartridges by consideration on barrels and projectiles types	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes.	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes.	

## Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(There is a need for the title to be reworded to include -when identifying bullets. This way, it will make more sense to the general audience)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The abstract as currently written did not give the reader a complete, concise understanding of the paper's research and findings)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(There is a need to edit this paper. Such software as Grammarly would help or probably utilize an editor)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(There is a need for this author to devote a section or paragraph to the method to provide clarity on the method utilized)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The result section highlighted the findings of the research. However, it is unclear on which methodology the results were based)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The conclusion reiterates some of the important evidence; however, lack of clarity on the method utilized to arrive at the results remains a weakness)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The reference did not conform to APA requirements)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

It is suggested that the author work on the title of this research.  
 The abstract need to be reworded to describe the work clearly. The author should ensure that it explains the research as briefly and clearly as possible.  
 There is a need for a methodology section  
 The reference should adhere to APA requirements.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**