
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: Dec 21, 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Dec 23, 2016
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: d66 Singular space	

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 is recommendable)</i> Author does outline singular space adequately	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> much too short – it should be more instructive	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> There are few spelling errors particularly in references where publications in Russian are written in non-English way. I suggest to use the title of an original publication and then quote that it is in Russian. Exception is, of course, Landau.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The paper is interesting, but it lacks results	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I suggest that the author provides some results of the singular space concept	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> It follows from 4. And 5.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> See comment 3.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	Major revision
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

