

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Adolescents' Perceptions of Exploring Professional Interests and Preferences using a Psychometric Tool"

Corresponding Author: Marios Koutsoukos
Email: koutsoukos.marios@ac.eap.gr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no1a33

Peer review:
Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Temesgen Lerebo Dobbo
Beijing Normal University, China

Published: 31.03.2021

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: Adolescents' Perceptions of Exploring Professional Interests and Preferences using a Psychometric Tool	
Manuscript Number: 12 pages	
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.	3
It would be better to be revised, that's why the title needs to be catchy and clever.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
the author tried to present how to conduct the study, but the objective and result of the study are unclear.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The whole article has grammar problems, the author has to refine the article line by line	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The author tried to explain what type of research was used and the number of sample sizes as well as the data collection procedure, but the author did not clearly specify the data collection tool, sampling techniques and the reason, as well as the methods of data analysis.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
The body has a number of problems including: misquotation, citation errors, in addition to some data type no longer clear, need to be reviewed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
To some extent it is accurate and supported by the body content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Okay, but it would be better to adopt the APA style	

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):

Please look at your article very thoroughly and make it clear that most of it is not clear very well

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article can be published, but the author must have perfected the entire content



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

