

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: An Investigation of Primary Students' Attitudes Toward the Science Course

Submitted: 02 May 2021

Accepted: 05 April 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Özay Soslu

Email: ozaysoslu@kmu.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v9no2a61

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Intakhab Alam Khan

Reviewer 2: Zouhaier Slimi

Published: 30.06.2022

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: 05 11 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 09 11 2021
Manuscript Title: AN INVESTIGATION OF PRIMARY STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SCIENCE COURSE IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES	
Manuscript Number:	
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.	3



<i>Yes, the title is adequate to the content of the article. However, it needs clarity about what type of variables addressed.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Yes, the abstract presents somehow the objects, method and results. However, the author needs to start with the scope of research, clarify objectives and define the types of variables studied. The language of the abstract should be reviewed for grammatical issues like a scanning; a data collection too; the teachers to eliminate the students' negative attitudes and ensure... T-TEST; ANOVA should be capital.</i> <i>Review the tense used, normally the study aims to determine and not aimed, to make the work active.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2.5
<i>Yes, there are grammatical errors to be reviewed. The text needs rechecking for consistency, clarity, engagement and delivery example, use of a cluster of words that can be replace by one word the determination of can be replace by determining; agreement issues such science lessons and not science lesson; It was concluded with the suggestions that can be presented, can be presented is not needed here.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5
<i>The author needs to determine the age, gender of participants, social background. What is the sampling method used?</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>The body needs to be reviewed use numbering for titles and subtitles. Divide literature, findings and analysis into themes to ease reading process.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>Yes, it is accurate and supported by the content. However, some paragraphs are very long and need to be reviewed to create a text balance. It is suggested to use themes aligned with the literature and research objectives.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>The references are comprehensive. However, they lack currency as few articles are current dating back to 2016-17 and 18.</i> <i>Review is required for spacing issues like Akyol, C. and Dikici, A. (2009). The Effect of Poetical Teaching Technique on Academic Achievement and Attitude of the Students .</i> <i>Böyük, U. and Erol, M. (2008). International Journal on Hands-on Science, 1646-8937 online 1646- 8945, Investigation of secondary school students' attitudes towards science and technology course and science experiments (Case of Muğla).</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. *Review the abstract carefully clarify scope, objectives, methods and findings.*
2. *Clarify the variables of your focus.*
3. *Use active tense and pay attention to language issues.*
4. *Review the language of the whole text thoroughly.*
5. *Use themes in literature review, analysis, findings and conclusions to make your work look more systematic and easier to access.*
6. *Use numbering for titles and subtitles to ease readability.*
7. *Get rid of the shades before and after the abstract.*
8. *Reinforce your resources with current literature 2019-2020-2021.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
 EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

