

# ***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!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 15.01.2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 19.01.2016
Manuscript Title:	
<b>POLICE USE OF EXCESSIVE FORCE A CASE STUDY</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 01134/16	

## **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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
Case studies look more like a "police use of lethal (deadly) force" not "an excessive force". The author should consider this, and will change the title.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
A proof read by a native speaker would be great.	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <b>Proper research gap should be identified</b> Instead of putting much emphasis on what the case study is, it would be better to elaborate little more about how the author utilizes case study technique for this particular research.	
<b>5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<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	<b>X</b>
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. Overall, this is a neatly organized and straightforward manuscript. I have a few recommendations.

- 1- Case studies mentioned in the manuscript look more like a "police use of lethal (deadly) force" not "an excessive force". The author should consider this, and will change the title.
- 2- A proof read by a native speaker would be great.
- 3- Instead of putting much emphasis on what the case study is, it would be better to elaborate little more about how the author utilizes case study technique for this particular research.

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

This manuscript is an invaluable piece of work that touches upon the issue of police use of lethal force. It is structured and straightforward. I recommend publishing the manuscript with minor changes.

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

