

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!

Date Manuscript Received: Aug. 16, 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION, BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT, AND PERFORMANCE: A CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0847/16	

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.	4
<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>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> There is need to thoroughly edit the paper.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The study seems to be an archival research method in the framework for conducting and evaluating research suggested by Searcy and Mentzer (2003). In the methods, the authors should have explained the process of reviewing the literature	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> This paper has more than 13,000 words and makes reading laborious. It is possible to reduce the paper to about 8,000 without losing the main trust of 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.	4
<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	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is need to reduce the word count to about 8,000 to make the paper interesting to read.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

