

## REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Culture and the Common European Framework for Languages: A Comparative Corpus Analysis of 2001, 2018 and 2020 Texts"

Corresponding Author: Mustafa Dolmaci  
Email: [dolmaci@selcuk.edu.tr](mailto:dolmaci@selcuk.edu.tr)

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no4a15

Peer review:  
Reviewer 1:Blinded  
Reviewer 2: Abdelali Kaaouach

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:19/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:28/07/2021
Manuscript Title: CULTURE AND THE COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK FOR LANGUAGES: A COMPARATIVE CORPUS ANALYSIS OF 2001, 2018 AND 2020 TEXTS	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4



<i>Yes the title is informative and representative of the content of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	3
<i>Yes, there is a presentation of the object of the study as well as its main results. It remains to integrate in the abstract, a sentence which briefly presents the methodology adopted in the comparative corpus analysis.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	4
<i>The text is well cared for without grammar and spelling mistakes.</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	4
<i>The comparative corpus analysis uses the tool Sketch Engine. This is described in the "methodology" part.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	4
<i>The body of the article is well structured. The writing style is scientifically sound, and without glaring errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	4
<i>The conclusion summarizes all parts of the article. In particular, it presents and discusses the results of the study.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	4
<i>Yes, sufficient and complete references to conduct the study.</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):**

Include a sentence in the abstract which succinctly describes the adopted method to conduct the comparative corpus analysis.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

