
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 recommended 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: 22 Mars 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 25 Mars 2018
Manuscript Title:	
ENTREPRENEURIAT JEUNES ET SECTEUR D'EMPLOIS D'ACTUALITE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02114/18	

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.	2
<i>Emploi des jeunes, ouverture économique, capital humain et IDE</i> <i>Ou</i> <i>Politiques publiques et emploi des jeunes : étude empirique</i> <i>Ou autre</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Abstract doit contenir objectif de l'étude, méthodologie et principaux résultats</i> <i>Réviser l'Abstract en anglais</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>Certaines références ne sont pas citées ou elles sont citées mais elles ne figurent pas dans le manuscrit, comme :</i> <i>Abderraouf, M. (2009). « Ouverture, capital humain et croissance économique dans la zone MENA (Middle East and North Africa), application sur les données de panel dynamique.» Université de Sousse, Tunisie.</i> <i>ARROW, K. J. (1973). “Higher education as a filter.” Journal of Public Economics, 2 (3), 193-216.</i> <i>AZARIADIS C. (1975), “Implicit Contracts and Underemployment Equilibria”, Journal of Political Economy, 83(6), p.1183-1202.</i> <i>Beaud, S. & Pialoux, M. (2003), « Violences urbaines, violence sociale, Genèse des nouvelles classes dangereuses », Paris : Fayard.</i> ...	2
<i>Autres Remarques:</i> - <i>La structure de manuscrit doit respecter la structure générale d’un article. Sa structure est celle d’une thèse ou d’un ouvrage...</i> - <i>la liste des tableaux et la liste des figures ne sont pas importantes dans un article...</i> - <i>l’output qui figure dans l’annexe, il est préférable de le refaire dans un tableau et le transférer dans le texte ...</i> - <i>les différentes parties de manuscrit doivent être réécrite...</i> - <i>la partie théorique est longue et des références intéressantes liées à la problématique ne sont pas mentionnées...</i> - <i>la partie empirique doit aussi être reformulée...</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

