

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:30/12/2015 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted:6/1/2016 |
| Manuscript Title: The Role of Technical Know-how in Determining the Legal Nature of a Franchise Contract | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0167/16 | |

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> The title is clear | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| <i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The abstract is clearly | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Scarcity of spelling and grammatical errors | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| The study relied on descriptive analytical method | |
| 5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The conclusions and summary are supported by the content. | |
| 6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(abrief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Good in terms of quantity, and where modernity. | |

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | X |
| Accepted, minor revisions needed | |
| 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.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study came to shed light on technical knowledge and its impact on determining the legal nature of a franchise contract. It also illuminates the possibility of the existence of a weak idea or a compliance problem in this type of contract .

I hope that the researcher taking the following observations:

- I hope that the definitions in the introduction to the study should be included.
- Should reconsiders the recommendation concerning the organization of the legislative concessions referring to the Article 117 of the Jordanian Constitution, which states all concession granting a right for the exploitation of mines or minerals or public utilities shall be sanctioned by law.