

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: 18.04.2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 21.04.2016
Manuscript Title:	
Intervention motion program of Rhythmical gymnastics and its impact on development of motor abilities	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04149/16	

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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
Authors' aim for the experiment is clearly stated. The authors present positive results of the experiment.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> For findings of this experiment were used appropriate statistical methods aimed to assess the levels of coordination ability.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

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):

I consider the theme of this study to be current.

Authors' aim for the experiment is clearly stated. For findings of this experiment were used appropriate statistical methods aimed to assess the levels of coordination ability.

Based on the authors' analysis of the statistical data collected, they have determined their findings. The authors have determined their findings, based on their analysis of the statistical data collected.

I recommend to publish the full extent of this study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: