

# ***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: <b>2017-08-16</b>	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: <b>2017-08-17</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Alternative off school Business Management Models that Enhance Multiple Intelligences among Secondary Students in Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>08119/17</b>	

## **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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [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>The title exceeds the number of words recommended in the APA format and can confuse the reader in their translation.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There are some grammatical errors, of style or translation of some words.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The methodological design lacks a description of the questionnaire used or designed and its reliability and validity, as well as a brief explanation of the categories used in the different items related to multiple intelligences and their research, as well as the criteria used in the Instruments of a qualitative nature. There is also no presentation of the information obtained in the interviews (how many people were interviewed, what type of interview was carried out, the criteria for designing the script for its realization ...</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>Throughout the text, mention is made in the analysis of the data to the verification of the use of teaching strategies based on multiple intelligences, but it does not end to be clearly indicated in how many centers are carried out or not. We are spoken at all times in the acquisition of skills analysis according to the learning context but are not clarified.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Conclusions and future lines of work need to be further developed.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>References are not current. We recommend including recent research for at least the last 5 years.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

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

