

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!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 4/4/17	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:4/11/17
Manuscript Title:	
Exploring Teachers' Perceptions on Organizational Climate in Urban and Rural Schools	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN 1857-7881(Print)	

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> Title is directly linked to content	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Include a statement about results.	4
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Minor editing recommended for possessives, articles, punctuation etc.	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	4

Qualitative research was explained.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Introduction should include a section for each component stated at the bottom of page 2 for clarity purposes.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Conclusions are clear except statement that “Principals can get in the way for collegiality and collaboration” This statement needs more substance/evidence.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</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):

Useful information for effective practices in educational leadership.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Good article with some revisions.

