

## REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Exploring the e-teaching and learning experiences of lecturers amidst COVID-19 at one of the University of Namibia satellite campuses"

Corresponding Author: Anna Niitembu Hako  
Email: ahako@unam.na

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no4a92

Peer review:  
Reviewer 1: Mohamed Jaafari  
Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: 12 October, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 October 2021
Manuscript Title: Exploring the e-teaching and learning experiences of lecturers amidst COVID-19 at one of the University of Namibia satellite campuses	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
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.

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



<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	5
The titles summarizes the issue and where it takes place	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	5
(Please insert your comments)The abstract states the objectives, the methods, and implications	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	5
No apparent and serious mistakes	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	5
The methods are explained in detail	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	5
No errors	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	5
Analysis, conclusions are accurate	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	5
(Please insert your comments)	

**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):**

**No suggestions**

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

to be published



**EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)**

