
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: 22.08.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:22.08.2017
Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF DEPOSITION TIME ON STRUCTURAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF SYNTHESIZED ZnO NANOFLOWERS WITHOUT USING COMPLEXING AGENT	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937/17	

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.

<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> The title is clear and it summarized the study well.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract includes the aim of the study, methodology and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The manuscript is well written.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The method of the study is given in the experimental details.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The manuscript is well written.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The results of characterizations (FESEM and XRD) are summarized well in conclusions and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The references are proper for this study.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This study is about the production and characterization of ZnO nanoflowers. Although there are many studies in the literature about this subject, the novelty of method used in this manuscript is environmentalist and the paper is publishable.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript is well written. The aim of the study and the results are explained clearly. Although there are many studies in the literature about this subject, the novelty of method used in this manuscript is environmentalist and the paper is publishable.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

