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: 9/06/2006	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 12/06/2016
Manuscript Title: **ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK FACTORS AT WORK AS CAUSE OF FAMILY DISINTEGRATION. CASE OF A TEXTILE COMPANY**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: M132	

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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating) **The objectives should be more specific and uniform. The formulation of the objectives is improvable.**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating) **Overall, it is satisfactory; nonetheless, there are certain parts where the English lacks a natural flow (almost as if a non-native English speaker had written it). I would highly recommend an**	

additional round of proofing with respect to the textuality of the content and to language precision. This article seems as if it was not written (or reviewed prior to submittal) by a native English speaker (or at least, there are parts that do not seem so).

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**

(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**

(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**

(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating

The conclusions need to be expanded considerably.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	*3*

(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)

A more up-to-date bibliography should have been included and there should have been a stricter adherence to the current APA style standards.

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):

In general, this article is a good job, with a lot of precision, interesting data and the result of an extensive bibliographical review.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

All the achievement criteria and indicators received a pass. Some of them were close calls, but a pass notwithstanding. I would give this article an overall grade of 3.5.