

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“The Selfitis Behavior Scale: An Adaptation Study”**

Corresponding Author: Ersun Ciplak

Email: ersunciplak@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no2a29

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zouhaier Slimi

International Maritime College, Oman

Reviewer 2: Mohamed Jaafari

University Cadi Ayyad, Marrakech, Morocco

Published: 30.06.2021

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 16 03 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 03 2021
Manuscript Title: The Selfitis Behavior Scale: An Adaptation Study	
Manuscript Number:	
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]
<p>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</p> <p><i>Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the paper content.</i></p>	4
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p> <p><i>Yes, the abstract clearly states the objectives, methods and results.</i></p> <p><i>However: It is recommended to review this sentence:</i> In the validity and reliability studies, data collection was performed from four study groups, including 343 university students.</p> <p><i>Suggestion:</i> Data collection was performed in the validity and reliability studies from four study groups, including 343 university students.</p>	4
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p> <p><i>Yes, there are few grammatical and structural errors to be reviewed.</i></p> <p><i>e.g., Introduction P.2 Wordy “find the answer to” could be replaced by “answer”</i></p> <p>Review this sentence as it is hard to read: <i>Some time ago, a fake news story appeared on social media claiming that 'selfitis' (selfie addiction) had been identified as a psychiatric disorder in the DSM, but the American Psychological Association...</i></p> <p>Review this sentence: <i>As reported by Safna (2017), selfie addiction may lead to several problems for young people, including accidents, suicide, plastic surgery, skin damage, and loss of self-confidence.</i></p> <p>Suggestion: <i>Safna (2017) reported that selfie addiction may lead to several problems for young people, including accidents, suicide, plastic surgery, skin damage, and loss of self-confidence.</i></p> <p>There is an overuse of passive form, try to reduce that.</p> <p>Rephrase: <i>However, a scale development study aims to assess the selfie attitude of high school students, as the literature shows (Ciplak and Cam, 2019).</i> Suggestion: <i>However, a scale development study aims to assess high school students' selfie attitude, as the literature shows (Ciplak and Cam, 2019).</i></p>	4

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes, the methods are well explained. However: Table 1 you have written "Fourt" it must be Fourth.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4.5
<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. However, Figures 1 and 2 need to be reviewed as some numbers are not that visible.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>Yes, the references are comprehensive and appropriate. However, they are limited to 2013-2018, it could be much better to included recent studies 2020 or 2021.</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:



EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 16.03.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.03.2021
Manuscript Title: The Selfitis Behavior Scale: An Adaptation Study	
Manuscript Number:	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

(Please insert your comments)

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Publish