

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: 4/17/18	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
<p>Manuscript Title: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS OF THE ROMAN ARMY ADMINISTRATION IS AN ARCHETYPE OF MODERN DAY HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</p>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 117.04.2018	

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]
<p>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</p> <p><i>The title is clear and captures the content of this article.</i></p>	4
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p> <p><i>The abstract presents objects, results but not the method of the research.</i></p>	3
<p>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p> <p><i>Too long sentences that can be broken down to make the paper flow better.</i></p>	4
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p> <p><i>The author did not describe the study method in this research. It would help to describe the study</i></p>	NA

<i>method.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The body of the paper is good. I would recommend for the author to break down the long sentences in this paper. The author failed to provide convincing argument about modern management stated in the abstract. The references were not adequate to support this paper.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusion needs more specifics to support the content and provide convincing augment of this research. This section needs more elaboration.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	2
<i>The references are not adequate for this research. The author of this article needs more references to provide support and justifications to this research.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The idea and the title of this paper sounds interesting. The abstract was good as well as the key words. The question of why Modern management should adopt the Roman army administration process has not been fully answered in your article. You need a stronger argument to convince readers of your article as well as providing more in depth references to support your paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This was an interesting and thoughtful research topic. I enjoyed reading it. The author needs more work to make this paper more meaningful and significance.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

