

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: “The Problems and Opinions of School Administrators during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Qualitative Study from Turkey”

Corresponding Author: Tufan Aytaç
Email: t.aytac@ahievran.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no4a5

Peer review:
Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Abdullah Aydın
Kirsehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey

Published: 30.12.2020

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!

Date Manuscript Received: September 11, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: September 18, 2020
Manuscript Title: The Problems Faced by School Administrators and their Opinions During COVID-19 Pandemic in Turkey: A Qualitative Study	
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]
------------------	--



<p>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The title is no clear and it is no adequate to the content of the article.</p> <p>The article title should be as follows: <i>“The Problems Faced by Some School Administrators and their Opinions During COVID-19 Pandemic in Different Cities of Turkey: A Qualitative Study”</i></p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The abstract partially presents objects, methods and results. These (objects, methods, results) should be checked and these must be rewritten.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)</p> <p>These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • covid-19 • March, 18, 2020 • TEDMEM, 2020.. • School administrators identified the lack of inclusion and distance education support for disabled students in need of special education as a problem area (f=10) during COVID-19 pandemic. <p>Also, some statements are repeated in the beginning of the paragraph (In the conclusion section).</p> <p>These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of the study • As a result of the research • The MoNE provided free internet right to parents' mobile lines fort he use of EBA. 	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The study methods are partially explained clearly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...all interviews were completed in one and a half months." This process should be explained. • "...other independent experts..."These experts should be explained (areas of expertise) • In this study, researcher and expert consensus rate should be explained. 	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p>The body of the paper is partially clear and does not contain errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “According to Miles and Huberman (1994), if 90% and more researcher and expert consensus is provided in qualitative research, coding study is considered reliable.” This ratio should be controlled. • Table 2, 5, 6, 7 should be checked. 	
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"> • These are shown on the text. 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<p>The references are partially comprehensive and appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are shown on the text. 	

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:

Strengths

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

Weaknesses



The article

- *Title*
- *Abstract*
- *Method*
- *Findings*
- *Conclusion*
- *References*

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



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

