

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“The State of Primary School Third-Grade Pupils’ Making Sense of the Concepts of “0” and “1” “**

Corresponding Author: Sıtkı Çekirdekci
Email: cekirdekci-sitki@hotmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no3a13

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Temesgen Lerebo Dobbo

Reviewer 2: Taofik Olatunji Bankole

Published: 30.09.2021

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:
<i>Manuscript Title: 'The State of Primary School Third-Grade Students' Making Sense of the Concepts of "0" and "1"'</i>	
Manuscript Number: 21	
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.	5
<i>It's quite clear and very powerful adequate title for whole text</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract clearly show what the researchers has been wanted to study or wanted to find out and how to find out. The researchers also clearly indicate what they have found throughout the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The researchers tried to used clearly and simple language to express their aim of study, method of study and result.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>It discussed very innovative manner and employed relevant methodology with methods</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>It contain powerful findings, but lack of discussion with relevant literatures</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>They did wonderful conclusions, but needs further to be strong in recommendation part</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4

It appropriate, but it would be better APA style

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):

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:	Date Review Report Submitted: April 25, 2021
Manuscript Title: The State of Primary School Third-Grade Students' Making Sense of the Concepts of "0" and "1"	
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: 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.	4
<i>Please, see the reviewed work for the appropriate section</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is okay. However, the authors should address the stated lapses in the methods and include them appropriately.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Quite minimal</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Please, see the reviewed work for the appropriate section</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>Please, see the reviewed work for the appropriate section</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Please, see the reviewed work for the appropriate section</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>It's okay</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):

Please, see as contained in the reviewed work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work is of good quality but it confirmatory for publication is dependent on the ability of the authors to effect the observed lapses appropriately.

