

# *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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: August 1, 2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: August 4, 2018
Manuscript Title: <b>An Empirical Analysis of Advanced Managerial Accounting Techniques on Decision Support System in Small and Medium Enterprises in Jordan</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0491/18</b>	

## **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>3</b>
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I suggest the title to be:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advanced Managerial Accounting Techniques and Decision Support System: An Empirical Analysis of Small and Medium Enterprises in Jordan</b></p>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i></p> <p><b>Abstract is generally okay.</b></p>	
<b>3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i></p>	

<b>No notable grammatical and spelling errors in the document</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> <b>The methodology is well presented. However, the researchers need to put paragraphs</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> <b>Avoid use of bullets in the introduction but use pros instead. Some of the citations in the body do not follow the APA style. In the section of results, the researchers need to interpret their results based on t- tests or p-values and should inform the reader the desired level of confidence used. They should also discuss their results briefly in comparison with relevant cited literature.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i> <b>This section is generally okay</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> <b>Ensure that all references cited in the document are listed in the section of list of references</b>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Incorporate the comments mentioned above

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

Give proper guidelines to the researchers on the outline of the article stipulating clearly the sections expected.

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

