
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: 08/06/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 13/06/2016
Manuscript Title: PRODUCCION EN BANANO CAVENDISH CON DESMANE FALSA MAS DOS Y FALSA MAS TRES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 78	

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.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The methods are missing. It is necessary to rewrite.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> There are a lot of orthographic mistakes.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> It is not clear the methodology: Where does the experiment was carried out? Which variables were studied? When were the variables measures? How do the authors process the variables? Was the t of Student calculated?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The Introduction is not complete. The methods lack in the paper.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Only one reference is from the last five years. They not follow a citation style	

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):

Analyze the comments in the revised document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

