
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: 04/22/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:04/24/2017
Manuscript Title: Defis d'une orthodoxie ethique et academique chez les universitaires congolais (RDC)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN:1857-7881 (Print) e-ISSN: 1857-7431	

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.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)- The abstract does not clearly present "methods". The study does however presents the methods being used.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
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>	

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):

Two areas in the abstract (English version) need better wording: “African scholarly community” and “the rupture of disrespectable practices...” African learned community might be the most appropriate. And “rupture” could be replaced by a different word, such as “break up” or “disruption.”

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This is a substantive analysis of the state of higher education in the Congo (DRC). Editorial changes would not affect the substance of the text.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

