

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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 12/23/2015	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 12/24/2015
Manuscript Title: An investigation study between two genders, public and private schools, through the achievement of the pupils in the exact sciences: A case study of selected secondary schools in Conakry, Guinea	
ESJ Manuscript Number: d135	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Needs thorough restructuring. It is not appearing as an abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Proper research gap should be identified	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(abrief 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):

This sheet is to be returned to the author(s) of the manuscript. Please provide reasons for acceptance or rejection as well as any suggestions that you might feel are appropriate for revisions or improvements.

- "Abstract" should be revised to focus the role of the research.**
- "Background" should be written in a clear way.**
- "Research Method: Environment and context of the study" Sampling method need be clarified.**

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper needs to be modified and corrected carefully.

