

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: Cyberloafing Behavior in Teachers: Diyarbakir Province Example

Submitted: 17 February 2022

Accepted: 14 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Yunus Emre Avci

Email: yunusemre@siirt.edu.tr

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v9no4a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Temesgen Lerebo Dobbo

Reviewer 2: Raymond Chipfakacha

Published: 31.12.2022

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: 23/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/07/2022
Manuscript Title: Cyberloafing Behavior in Teachers	
Manuscript Number: 19	
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.	
<i>The title seems good, but not clear for the reader so the author needs to make to be clear for everyone. The author gives a few reasons to justify his/her choice of topic, but the reasons fail to form a whole. The literature review is too brief.</i>	



2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>The author try to address all the issues which abstract supposed contain, but difficulty to understand idea as whole. The author must have refined this part. The abstract must be italic format and it is not more than 250 words</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>The article has several format, grammatical, punctuation and spelling error. There are awkward sentence and using inappropriate language, have lack of coherence between sentences, but as a whole, the thesis is understandable</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The author describes the data collection methods, but the description of the process is clearly inadequate. The author describes the analysis methods, data processing stages, and analysis, but the description does not form a coherent and logical whole. The analysis the methods, methods are mainly chosen to answer the research questions, but the author has insufficient command of the methods.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>It seem little bite clear as whole, but there are several error related to citation, used too old reference, no personal identification code for interviewee, interviewees statement was not indent among others. The findings can be understood to answer the research question, but they are not presented clearly or logically. The layout of the article and figures used is smart</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The author try to summary what he/she has been done in the body as it is with supporting evidence, but still need to be strong.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>The author uses at least some Finnish and international source literature. The source material is relevant to the topic of the thesis, but not follow APA style or appropriate reference style</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):

This is paper can be publishable after minor revision in light of above comments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

***EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form
2022***

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: 8/6/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/7/22
Manuscript Title:	Cyberloafing Behavior in Teachers



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]
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.	4
<i>The abstract is clear as it captures the problem, methodology used to collect data, the analysis and as well as the findings of the study.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The paper should go through language editing so that the quality of the paper is not compromised.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The study methods are clearly articulated. There is room to describe how the simple random process was used to select participants in the study.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is clear. It is however critical to conduct a grammar and spelling check throughout the paper.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3

<i>There is merit in separating the conclusion from the discussion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are adequate for 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):

The author can take note of my recommendations to do the minor additions and submit.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
 EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

