

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Performance Measures of the Academic Managerial Spine”**

Corresponding Author: Eyal Eckhaus

Email: eyale@ariel.ac.il

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no4a7

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zouhaier Slimi

International Maritime College, Oman

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: 26 10 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 10 2020
Manuscript Title: Performance Measures of the Managerial Spine	
Manuscript Number: 4	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
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.	4



<i>The title is clear and is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>The abstract clearly presents methods and results. However, the objective needs clarification and few language issues in the abstract to be addressed. The text should be Justify. (Language issues are all annotated within the article itself)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>Yes, there are few issues related to grammar and spelling. For the sake of time. Refer to the original paper to see all the highlighted issues.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study methods are clear.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The body paper requires more focus on aligning the text with Headings and subheadings to make the work more appealing. Tables and figures titles positions should be reviewed for the sake of consistency.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>Conclusion and summary are ok and do support the content of the paper.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>References should be reviewed and mainly in text-citation.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):



Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



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

