
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: 05.01.2017 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 17.01.2017 |
| Manuscript Title: CONTRIBUTION OF STOCK MARKET TOWARDS ECONOMIC GROWTH: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON BANGLADESH ECONOMY | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: jan87 | |

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 is recommendable)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| I found very few grammatical errors that I suggested to check and change. | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| Some missing citations in Reference List are observed in the first page of the paper. | |

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. Authors may include the selected data period (i.e., 1994 to 2015) in abstract.
2. Authors may mention the statistical software (i.e., STATA, Eviews) used to analyze the data in the methodology part.
3. Authors may include the missing references in the Reference List cited in the text (for specification, please see the attached document).
4. Please check the grammatical errors suggested in the attached file.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thank you for selecting me as a reviewer of the paper. I found the paper interesting and justified for recent context. All parts are properly written and analyzed. This paper may be accepted after minor revisions.

