
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 16 December 2016
Manuscript Title: Sustainable biodiesel production from Waste cooking Oil and chicken fat as an Alternative Fuel for Diesel Engine	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 122.	

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. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	4
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	2

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references are very poor. The authors should do a strong bibliography revision.</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):

This paper is very poor concerning methodological aspects and also very poor in state of the art. The authors should do a strong bibliographical revision and to compare their results with this bibliography.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper is interesting, but is very poor in methodological and bibliography aspects. In my opinion is adequate to this journal, but it need to improve the above aspects.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

