

## REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“University Students' Internet Addiction Levels Under Various Variables”**

Corresponding Author: Olcay Salic

Email: [olcaysalici@sdu.edu.tr](mailto:olcaysalici@sdu.edu.tr)

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no3a7

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Reuben Gitonga Mutegi

University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Cuauhtemoc A. Carboni

Imperial Valley College, USA

Published: 30.09.2020

## ***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!***

Reviewer Name: DR. Reuben Gitonga Mutegi	Email: rmutegi@uonbi.ac.ke
University/Country: University of Nairobi, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Analysis of Children's Primary School Readiness According to Some Variable	
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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and concise	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract indicates the objectives, methodology, results and recommendations. It gives detailed summary of the paper	
	<b>4</b>
<i>the introduction captures the theme of the paper and gives good motivation that's prompts paper of this nature to be developed</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The methodology well defined as well as the target population and justification for the design</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The body is clear but requires some editing. The thought process needs to be logical</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Conclusion well outlined and giving a true picture of the research problem</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>References are ok but need to be aligned to APA style of referencing</i>	

**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):**

There is need to include recommendations in the abstract in order to make it complete, on goals of the study, you can use the term “ objectives” of the study instead of “ Goal”. Objectives are more specific compared to goals which are general. Table 1 seem to be misplaced. If it represents target population, then no need of adding other categories of respondents who are not part of the target population. Table 2 also seem to be misplaced. The content in the CFA PATH diagram is not clear, need to increase the font. There is need to number the subheading under the results section e.g. 4.1, 4.2, 4.3. It’s easy to follow that way. No need to have citations in the conclusion since they are already been discussed under the results section

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

Check the sequential organization of the thought process and grammar. Need also to ensure there is proper numbering of subheadings in the entire document. The paper is good and useful to guide in policies especially geared towards promoting high enrolment rates in pre-schools