

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Attributes of 3D computer models for learning the structure of atom by undergraduate science teacher students”**

Corresponding Author: Mustafa Akilli
Email: akilli@uludag.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no2a85

Peer review:
Reviewer 1: Mary Ann Hollingsworth
University of West Alabama, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Attributes of 3D computer models for learning the structure of atom by undergraduate science teacher students | |
| Manuscript Number: | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> 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. | 5 |
| The title of the paper adequately represents the focus of the study in that the study did examine the components identified in the title of the paper. | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| The first sentence of the abstract indicates the objective of the study. More depth is needed about the method employed – such as narrative summary of the information in figure 1. The description of results should have statement of the 3 analyses described in the section “Results of Research” – this should be included before the last sentence of the abstract. | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| The first two lines in the section “Methodology of Research” had some spelling errors. Otherwise, the article seemed to have correct grammar and spelling. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| The Methodology section provides clear description of all aspects of the study method employed to include several tables and figures for further enhancement of clarity. | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| Other than the feedback noted in other sections of this review, the body of the paper was well-organized and clear in presentation of background, methodology, and study results. | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| The section “Discussion and Conclusion” provided clear summary of the content of the paper. It began with a restatement of the study purpose, summarized the different data-analyses performed, | |

| | |
|---|---|
| and ended with a statement of overall results obtained as related to the objective of the study. | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| The reference list provides extensive support for different components of the study and represents a thorough blend of applicable background and other research that is relevant to this study. | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): This article is well-organized and comprehensive in presentation of background, conduct, and results of the study. As noted in this review, there are just a couple of places in the article where minor revision is recommended for better clarity for the readership.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only