

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“DETERMINATION OF THE OPINIONS OF PROSPECTIVE SCIENCE TEACHERS ABOUT BIOLOGY LESSONS TAUGHT THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION (A FOCUS GROUP STUDY)”**

Corresponding Author: Emrah Özbuğutu
Email: emrahozbugutu@hotmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no2a1

Peer review:
Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Abdelali Kaaouach
University Mohammed I, Morocco

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: 05.02.2021 and 10.02.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.02.2021
Manuscript Title: DETERMINATION OF THE OPINIONS OF PROSPECTIVE SCIENCE TEACHERS ABOUT BIOLOGY LESSONS TAUGHT THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION (A FOCUS GROUP STUDY)	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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.	2
<i>It should be said the level of the education the article is taking into consideration. I wonder if it is necessary that the title contains the words "Focus group study", this is part of the methodology.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>It is too long.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>I cannot be sure about English</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>References about methodology should be given in more details. It is written that this study has not previous examples. This assumption seems in contrast with so many studies available about the same studies on the subject</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>It is not clearly described the presences of two samples: teachers and students.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Conclusion need to be related to the content considering the previous and post situation of learning.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	?
<i>All quotation are in a language I do not know. There should be references from international scientific context.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: 09/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/04/2021
Manuscript Title: DETERMINATION OF THE OPINIONS OF PROSPECTIVE SCIENCE TEACHERS ABOUT BIOLOGY LESSONS TAUGHT THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is informative and includes the key words on which the text is based.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract integrates the general objective (opinions of prospective teachers about biology lessons conducted through distance education), the methodology (focus group with 15 prospective teachers), and the main results .	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The text is well written.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The method is well explained (participants, questions, data collection, data analysis). Except, the selection of participants via simple random sampling techniques.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The text is well written with the IMFC (Introduction, Method, Findings, Conclusion) form of structuring ideas. Generally, these ideas are clear and justified.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4

A good accuracy of the conclusion which supports the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
A comprehensive and appropriate list of references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is preferable and informative that the authors detail the selection method of participants via simple random sampling techniques.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: