

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: 1/15/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 1/22/2016
Manuscript Title: Risk Factors of Obesity in Low Income Head Start Children	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

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.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Only reported sociodemographic characteristics. Does not reflect caregivers. Title was a bit misleading.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Needs reorganizing and more detail to reflect results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
Too many grammatical errors. Need to structure sentences for improved clarity. Lack of consistency in paragraph structuring (some too short example 1 sentence). Some run on sentences.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Methods not clear. Need more details to clarify how and what was done.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Strengths and limitations not identified. The 'So What' was not answered. Logistic regression nor Chi square were not identified in the result.	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
References were too dated and inconsistent formatting throughout.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Return to author for major revision. The author may consider the following:

1. Make sentences more precise and well structured.
2. Paragraphs need to be well structured in information and length.
3. Providing numerals may improve clarify.
4. References are outdated.
5. More detail is needed in the paper especially methodology.
6. Fonts should be consistent in size and type.
7. Statistics and significance not clearly defined and presented.
8. Proofreading is absolutely needed.

The paper if well-organized may provide some insight on how parents perceive doctors recommendations and diagnoses.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I suggest returning to author for major revisions and possible resubmit.

