

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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: 16/12/2015	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: ESTUDIO DE LOS CENTROS PRIVADOS CONCERTADOS RELIGIOSOS, DESDE LA PERSPECTIVA DE SUS DIRECTORES TITULARES, EN EL CONTEXTO MULTICULTURAL DE LA CIUDAD AUTÓNOMA DE CEUTA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0102/16	

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>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
Needs thorough restructuring. It is not appearing as an abstract. The abstract follows the format of introduction, research methodology, results and conclusions. Es recomendable que el resumen siga el formato de introducción, metodología, resultados y conclusiones.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
Proper research gap should be identified	
It does not indicate numbers surveyed, and reliability and validity of the questionnaires used. The explanation of the research process and the technique of focus groups is not sufficiently clarified.	
No indica con claridad la muestra de los cuestionarios, ni la fiabilidad y validez de los cuestionarios empleados. La explicación sobre el proceso investigador y la técnica de grupos de discusión no queda suficientemente clarificada.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: