

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Science Education for Gifted Students: Opinions of Students, Parents, and Teachers"

Corresponding Author: Nagihan Tanik Onal
Email: nagihanta@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no1a15

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zouhaier Slimi
International Maritime College, Oman

Reviewer 2: Abdullah Aydın
Kırsehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey

Published: 31.03.2021

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: 15-12-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18-12-2020
Manuscript Title: SCIENCE EDUCATION FOR GIFTED STUDENTS: OPINIONS OF STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND TEACHERS	
Manuscript Number: 6	
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>Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results. However, it needs a review to restructure and fix a few language issues.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>Yes, the article contains few language issues as redundancy, structure and inconsistency in spelling using American and English spelling. The comments and correction are made directly on the script.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes, the study method is clearly explained.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is straightforward and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes, the body is clear and follows the structure.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, the conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>Yes, the references are comprehensive and relevant. However, there are a few punctuation issues to be revised.</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):

Please review the language issues.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)



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: Dec. 16 , 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: Dec. 29 , 2020
Manuscript Title: SCIENCE EDUCATION FOR GIFTED STUDENTS: OPINIONS OF STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND TEACHERS	
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 in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes /No	

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
<p>The title is no clear and it is no adequate to the content of the article. This part (3.4 and 4.4) should be removed from the text or title should be changed.</p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<p>The abstract partially presents objects, methods and results. This (methods) should be checked and must be written.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hocam, (in 3.2 and 3.3 section) • “gifted children/gifted students”, this should be checked(In the whole text). • “seven parents (3 males, 4 males)”, (in 2.2) • “ST”, the full name must be written, (in 3.2) • “uhm”, this should be checked, (in 3.2) • “P2”, this should be checked, (in 3.3) 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>The study methods are partially explained clearly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This (when the research data were collected? /in their ...-...academic year) should be checked and must be written (in 2.3) 	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<p>The body of the paper is partially clear and does not contain errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract needs to be restructured so that it is suitable for scientific research and not in a form suitable for a thesis. • Introduction to the study needs to be expanded and more studies in order to fully reflect the research data. Add more previous studies that dealt with the same topic. • Re-division of the study methodology in a manner consistent with a scientific research rather than a thesis. 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<p>The conclusions or summary are partially accurate and supported by the content.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>These are shown on the text.</i> 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<p>The references are partially comprehensive and appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The references are quite poor. In 32 references, we can find one with five years or less.</i> 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I have written them in the “**Evaluation Criteria to author/s**” section.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Strengths

The topic is **promising** but the paper is not substantial as it is.

Weaknesses

The article

- *“Title*
- *Abstract*
- *Methods*
- *Findings*
- *Conclusion and Discussions*
- *References”*



is **poorly written** largely due to unfamiliarity with the conventions of research articles.



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

