

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Students' Views in the use of Augmented Reality Technology in Teaching Science"

Corresponding Author: Orhan Karamustafaoglu
Email: orhan.karamustafaoglu@amasya.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no4a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Intakhab Alam Khan

Reviewer 2: Taofik Olatunji Bankole

Published: 31.12.2021

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: STUDENT VIEWS ON THE USE OF AUGMENTED REALITY TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING SCIENCE	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
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.	3



<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed JUST THE DOUBTS (see attached)	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	



Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
please see attached
Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
please see attached



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: Students' Views on the Use of Augmented Reality Technology in Teaching Science	



Manuscript Number: Not provided
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/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.	4
<i>There is no discrepancy between the title and body of the work</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>It's okay, nevertheless, the authors should include the results/findings of the study in accordance with the research questions of the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Satisfactory</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study method is okay, with an insignificant correction – please, see the body of the work.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>This is very okay.</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Please, see as stated in the body of the work.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Please, see comment as stated in the body of the work</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):

The work is quite revealing, and of course will contribute significantly to the body of knowledge. I am okay with the adopted method, the way the findings are presented and the arguments in the results and discussion of findings section. The identified lapses are meant to add to the quality of the paper. Thus, it's imperative that the suggestions are addressed appropriately.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I am satisfied with the quality of the work. However, the identified lapses should be effected appropriately.



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

