
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: 02/11/2016 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 16/11/2016 |
| Manuscript Title: INFORMATION NEEDS AND INFORMATION SEEKING BEHAVIOUR OF THE PHYSICALLY CHALLENGED: A SURVEY OF MODUPE COLE MEMORIAL CHILD CARE & TREATMENT HOME SCHOOL AKOKA, LAGOS | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: n76 | |

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. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <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> | |

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):

1. Table numbers and table titles should be situated together on top of every table. The Table titles should not be in Question forms.
2. There is a need for a few of more recent citations to update the currency of the article content.
3. The findings of the study should be discussed under a segment to be titled 'Discussion of the Findings'. This is with a view to comparing the findings with the reviewed literature.
4. The last segment titled 'Conclusion' should be re-titled 'Conclusion and Recommendations', as it contains some recommendations, as it is.
5. The author needs to be instructed on the Journal's Referencing Style, so that the Reference List can be compiled using a particular style. As it is now, there is no such style in the compilation.
6. Every cited work in the body of the paper must be accounted for under the References. The case of 'Needham William' can serve as an example of such an omission here.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The originality of the paper is in its focus on the group of disadvantaged segment of the Nigerian society; otherwise known as the 'neglected'. This is the strong point of the paper for which value it is hereby recommended for publication subject to the minor corrections pointed out above.

