

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Reflections of a Social Constructivist on Teaching Methods”**

Corresponding Author: Erdem Erciyas

Email: erdemerciyes@yahoo.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no4a2

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.12.2020

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: EJES 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.

EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: Oct 12 th , 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: Oct 15 th , 2020
Manuscript Title: Reflections Of A Social Constructivist On Teaching Methods	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	3



<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The author used action research method to conduct the research project, but did not provide any details on the planning. Where is the data gathering for this action research? What are the data analysis for your results? The literature review is not sufficient for the actions proposed.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>Who are the participants? Are there IRB approved for this research? What are the hypotheses? What is the data analysis?</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Not sufficient literature review</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>



Return for major revision and resubmission	Yes
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



**EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)**

