
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:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43.02.2017	

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>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) the candidate should revise the work to ensure that appropriate tenses are used, one form of tense should be should used in the background and review.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) Yes, almost clearly explained but could expatiated on for</i>	

<i>more clarity and ease of understanding.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) Only few spelling and grammatical errors were noticed</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) Though they are clear and support the content but could be clearer with a bit of elaboration</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable) very appropriate and somewhat comprehensive</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): *the need to state the exact number of Nursing Schools in the Southwest, Nigeria. The number of students is determinable; it should thus be stated too. Methodology needs recasting to bring out clearly the school population, student population should be both given, process of instrumentation clearly stated and since there are two components in the instrument the psychometric properties of each should be given separately. The actual statistics should be given under the methodology. Discussion should be mre detailed and having reasons for agreement and otherwise and what each result means.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: *The editors should do the editing and formatting to conform with requirement of the journal. Editors should ensure the candidate effects the corrections before publication. The corrections are between minor and a bit more tha minor but less than the one that will warrant resubmission.*

