

# ***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: 12 <sup>th</sup> August 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 15 <sup>th</sup> August 2017
Manuscript Title:	
Alternative off School Business Management Models that Enhance Multiple Intelligences among Secondary Students in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 08119/17	

## **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.

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The topic should include the “ <i>school</i> ” to read..... secondary <i>school</i> students in Kenya	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> All basic information is included in the abstract.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> 1) Not all cited sources are referenced and not all referenced sources are cited- for example shearer(2004), Woessmann (2006), shepard (2004), Cummings et al (2005), Webb & Vulliammy (2004), Wilkin et al (2003), Ombour(2014) and Gardner (1999). 2) A source cited as Bastian (1995) is referenced as Bastiani (1995). Which one is the right source?	

**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):**

Besides addressing the above suggested corrections do counter check the percentages to be certain that they are correct.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**Accept with minor corrections.**

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

