
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: 13.4.2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 17.4.2018
Manuscript Title: Homelessness and unemployment during the economic recession: The case of the city of Girona.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 120.04.2018	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title is perfect	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The results should be specific. Highlight the main findings from the correlations and regression.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> There are a few grammatical errors in translating from Spanish to English.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The methods are discussed but not shown. There is need to show the regression model so that it	

can be interrogated. Other variables that determine homelessness should also be discussed. The peculiarity of the economic crisis period must be discussed and captured in modeling with a dummy.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The body is fairly well written.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The content should be strengthened with statistics and regression results so that the reader can appreciate the conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	5
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</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. Strengthen it with statistics from correlation and regression outputs. Show the regression model and include in the model other control variables that determine homelessness. Discuss the peculiarities of the crisis period and show how they could have affected homelessness in your city. Capture the peculiarities in the model with a dummy for the crisis period. Discuss the case of female homelessness further since it does not seem to move with unemployment.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: None

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

