

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: Dr. Angela Bourne	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 12/10/18	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Student Academic Engagement Levels and Satisfaction with School Design: Correlations	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve your name as a reviewer of this paper is available on the ESJ's website: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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.	4
<i>(teacher engagement needs to be factored into the title)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<p><i>The first impression of the abstract does not encourage a reader to continue reading as it the writing style is difficult to understand and there does not seem to be a “positioning “of the issue or concern. A soft opening is needed to raise the curiosity of the reader. Ie. Phase information to cover:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did you do this study or project? • What did you do, and how? • What did you find? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What do your findings mean? 	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(quite good)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(yes)</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(yes)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(yes)</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):

(I believe if your goal is to get administrators and educators to read this and put the recommendations into practice that a less academic writing style summary is required.)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

