REVIEW HISTORY

# Paper: "Development of The Stem Career Interest Scale for High School Students"

Corresponding Author: Esra Kizilay Email: <u>eguven@erciyes.edu.tr</u>

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no3a4

Peer review: Reviewer 1: Prasart Nuangchalerm Mahasarakham University, Thailand

Reviewer 2: Fatima Rahim Abdul-Hussein University of Misan, Iraq

Published: 30.09.2020



## **EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020**

· 6g -

European Scientific Institute

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!

Reviewer Name:	Fatima Rahim Abdul-Hussein		
University/Country: University of Misan /basic Education college /English department/ Iraq			
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: : 14.July,2020		
Manuscript Title: DEVELOPMENT OF THE STEM CAREER INTEREST SCALE			
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.





European Scientific Institute

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
<i>The title should be DEVELOPMENT OF THE STEM CAREER INTER HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS</i> .	REST SCALE FOR
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	Good
The abstract is not well-versed.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
The shift in tenses from present to past and use passive voice, and <b>m</b> errors and spelling mistakes is found.	aany grammatical
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	good
4. The study methods are explained clearly. A detailed analysis of the selected and the results are presented qual quantitatively.	6
A detailed analysis of the selected and the results are presented qual	6
A detailed analysis of the selected and the results are presented qual quantitatively.	itatively and good d and background al background
<ul> <li>A detailed analysis of the selected and the results are presented qual quantitatively.</li> <li>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</li> <li>The research is not carefully designed and the topics well -presented information and content are not rightly documented. The theoretical content are not rightly documented.</li> </ul>	itatively and good d and background al background
<ul> <li>A detailed analysis of the selected and the results are presented qual quantitatively.</li> <li>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</li> <li>The research is not carefully designed and the topics well -presented information and content are not rightly documented. The theoretical provides too much relatively adequate knowledge for subsequent det</li> <li>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by</li> </ul>	itatively and good d and background u background ails.
<ul> <li>A detailed analysis of the selected and the results are presented qual quantitatively.</li> <li>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</li> <li>The research is not carefully designed and the topics well -presented information and content are not rightly documented. The theoretical provides too much relatively adequate knowledge for subsequent det</li> <li>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</li> </ul>	itatively and good d and background u background ails.

### **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision	needed
✓ Accepted, mine	r revision needed





European Scientific Institute

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

#### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Kindly show your problem and its significance of this study

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** 

