

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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!***

Date Manuscript Received: Sat, February 10, 2018 12:55 pm	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 13/02/2018
<b>Manuscript Title: PAY AS YOU DRINK FOR SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY WATER PROJECTS</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0926/17	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The title is brief and to the point, it is clear)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Objective, methods, results conclusions and recommendation very clear)</i>	
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(While there are no serious grammatical errors in the paper, there are minor are typographical errors that need to be corrected before publications including, repeated word "the" Joined words e.g countries(UNDP2006), thatonly etc. The comments made on the document should be actioned and deleted for the final version. )</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(the methodology is clear)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(I recommend working on one objective as per the results and concentrate the statement of the problem to one paragraph)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Conclusion and summary very clear)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(References well done but with room for improvement in terms of consistence in text and on the reference list e.g(UNAIDS, WHO, 2007). In page 3 is UNAIDS, W. (2007). 2007 AIDS epidemic update. PDF). December on reference list page 15. Also check completeness as per APA)</i>	
<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):**

This is a good paper, brief and to the point. Work on the minor corrections suggested and remove track changes and comments as you submit the final copy. Generally the work require minor edits and formatting. Overall, GOOD.

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

This is a good paper, brief and to the point. The authors need to work on the minor corrections suggested and remove track changes and comments as you submit the final copy. Generally the work require minor edits and formatting. Overall, GOOD.

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

