REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Organizational Image and its Relation with Leader-member Exchange and Organizational Justice in Schools"

Corresponding Author: Ahmet Saylik

Email: ahmet.saylik@siirt.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no3a111

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Uzma Shahzadi

Reviewer 2: Dimitrios Lampakis

Published: 30.09.2021



European Journal of Educational Sciences European Scientific Institute

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: ORGANIZATIONAL IMAGE AND ITS RELATION WITH LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN SCHOOLS | | |
| Manuscript Number: no number is given | | |
| 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 av You approve, this review report is available in the "review | • • • | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions

| Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]





| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| | - 14 |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| * ** * | |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

| Accepted, no revision needed | |
|--------------------------------------------|--|
| Accepted, minor revision needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |



European Scientific Institute

| D . | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| L D 0100t | | |
| Reject | | |
| 110000 | | |
| | | |
| | | |

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: 04/08/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 09/08/2021 | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--|
| Manuscript Title: | | |
| Manuscript Number: ORGANIZATIONAL IMAGE AND ITS RELATION WITH LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE IN SCHOOLS | | |
| 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.

| Questions | Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |





| (Please insert your comments) | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| 4. The study methods are explained alcorby | 5 |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | <u></u> |
| (Please insert your comments) | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) The discussion at the end of this article is rather limited. I suggest the autreferences for further comparison/commentation. | thors to add more recent |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| (Please insert your comments) The conclusions are not clearly presented. I suggest the authors to add a sparagraph/section | separate Conclusions |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| (Please insert your comments) The references are comprehensive and appropriate, however more recent added. | references need to be |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

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



European Scientific Institute

| | 1 |
|-------------|---|
| Deignet | 1 |
| U 0 1 0 0 f | 1 |
| Keleci | 1 |
| Reject | 1 |
| U | 1 |
| | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The reported data are interesting; however, they are not sufficiently discussed and commented. By improving the text, the article may be published

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

By taking into account the interest of this work, in my opinion this paper deserves publishing.



