
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). 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!

Reviewer Name: Vera Komarova	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/10/2018
Manuscript Title: The insurance industry in Japan: an overview and environmental analysis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1017/18	
You agree your name to be revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I would like to recommend “insurance sector” instead of “insurance industry”, because an industry is more closely to producing/manufacturing of goods, but not to providing services. I see just overview in the content of the article, but not analysis.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract is too short; research methods (Five Force Model and PEST Model) and brief results could be added to the text of abstract.	

Such words as “fortunately”, “as everyone knows” are unacceptable in scientific texts.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I have marked those places in the text where I can see poor quality of English (grammatical and style’s errors) – there are a lot of them in the text	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods - Five Force Model and PEST Model – are declared, but not applied in the research. Any other methods are not explained at all.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> First conclusion was written at once in the Introduction (it is not clear then, why the research was needed). Conclusions cover just economic environment, but the author promised to analyze many other types of the environment in the Introduction.	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Last year of sources is 2015. It was nothing published on this topic after 2015?	

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):

(Please summarize your opinion and suggestions)

Main recommendations:

- 1) To use newer data and newer sources;
- 2) To correct English
- 3) To make your text scientific: you have to put clear aim, research problem, methods, results of applied analysis and discussion, but not just description of statistical figures. It has not to be the report, it has to be scientific paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

