Paper: **"Determiantion of Reading Anxiety of Primary School 4 th Grade Students"**

Corresponding Author: Yalcin Bay

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luka Pongracic
University of Slavonski Brod, Croatia

Reviewer 2: Abdullah Aydin
Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey

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: 9.2.2023.	Date Review Report Submitted: 16.2.2023.
Manuscript Title: DETERMINATION OF READING ANXIETY OF PRIMARY SCHOOL 4TH GRADE STUDENTS	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title of the article fully corresponds to the content of the article and the conducted research.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The summary clearly describes the topic covered in the article, explains the methodology. The measuring instrument is listed and a summary of the research results is presented. It would be good to add another sentence at the end of the abstract that would briefly explain the concluding observations of the article.

Keywords correspond to the most important segments of the article.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

The language used in the article is very good. A bit of scientific discourse is missing, but I wouldn't single this out as a mistake. The language of the profession is mainly used. Some sentences are too long and the conjunction *and* is used too much. This sentence should be made into two or more shorter and clearer sentences:

- *Based on these definitions, Bay (2008) defined reading as the perception of shapes, symbols, **and** pictures determined by the societies to make universal feelings, thoughts, experiences, **and** impressions permanent **and** to transfer them to the other party, **and** the activity of reinterpreting **and** restructuring the perceived items in mind.*

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

The methodology is clearly and thoroughly described. The participants and the instrument are described in an understandable and detailed way. Statistical analyzes of reliability were made. The performed statistical tests correspond to the set instrument and methodology. The results are excellently explained and presented in tables that fully correspond to everything stated. An accurate and precise interpretation of the results is written. In the discussion, the results were compared with similar research and the relevance of the research conducted in this article was explained.

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4

In some places too many authors are listed. Not all the listed articles and books have the same methodology and procedures. What authors obtained in their research should be further grouped:

- *The studies on reading anxiety are mainly related to foreign language teaching, and they examine the effect of reading anxiety on foreign language acquisition (Altunkaya, 2017, Brantmeier, 2005, Capan & Karaca, 2013, Herron, 2006, Horwitz & Garza, 1999, Ialongo, Edelsohn, Werthamer-Larsson, Crockett & Kellam, 1995, Liu & Hu, 2009, Lu & Lui, 2015, MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989, Mills, Pajares & Park & French, 2013, Pichette, 2009, Rajaba et al., 2012, Saito & Wu, 2011, Sellers, 2000, Young, 1986, Zhao, Guo & Dynia, 2013, Zoghi, 2013).*

- *In recent years, studies were conducted to determine the effects of primary and secondary school students' reading anxiety on fluent reading, reading comprehension and reading motivation (Aygün, 2021, Baki, 2017, Baki, 2019, Çeliktürk & Yamaç, 2015, Çevik, Orakçı, Aktan & Toraman, 2019, Dursun & Özenç, 2019, Grills-Taquechel, Fletcher, Vaughn & Stuebing, 2012, İzci & Kaya, 2021, Katrancı & Kuşdemir, 2016, Melanlıoğlu, 2014, Özcan & Karakaya, 2020, Şahin, 2019, Taşdemir & Taşdemir, 2020, Tonka, 2020, Uçgun, 2016, Yamaç & Sezgin, 2018, Yildiz & Akyol, 2011, Yildiz & Ceyhan, 2016).*

- *The literature review showed similar results, reporting that there is no significant difference between reading anxiety according to gender (Arslan, 2017, Ateş & Bahşi, 2019, Altunkaya, 2017, Baki, 2019, Çevik, Orakçı, Aktan & Toraman, 2019, Kılınç & Yenen, 2016, Öy, 1990, Şahin, 2019, Taşdemir & Taşdemir, 2020, Yamaç & Sezgin, 2018, Yıldız & Ceyhan, 2016). However, some studies (Alisinanoğlu*

& Ulutaş, 2003, İzci & Kaya, 2021, Jafarigohar & Behrooznia, 2012, Park & French, 2013, Plotnik, 2009, Uçgun, 2016, Toros & Tataroğlu, 2002)

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4

The conclusion corresponds to the conducted research and the obtained results. In conclusion, it would be good to refer in more detail to the concretely obtained results. My recommendation is to expand the first part of the conclusion.

Recommendations for further work are given, which gives this article relevance.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4

The bibliography is very comprehensive and fits the article very well. It is still necessary to arrange it technically. It needs to be aligned with APA style, because some references are not listed as they should be according to the rules. Italics are missing from most of the literature when citing the names of books, journals and proceedings. Titles of books and articles listed in Turkish should be translated into English and put in brackets [ ]

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 article provides a clear overview of the literature in the mentioned area. The methodology is clear and precise. In the article, it is necessary to make several refinements of a more technical nature. As for the content itself, everything is fine except for those few parts where many authors are listed in one place. This should be explained in more detail and grouped regarding their methodologies and results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I believe that this article makes a significant scientific contribution to a field that is very current. In general, the article is excellent and contains all the components of an original scientific work. The methodology is clear, precise and detailed, and the statistical tests used are accurately presented and interpreted.
It is recommended that the article be published after the author has made minor changes of a more technical and linguistic nature.

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form
2023

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: July 26, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: August 02, 2023
Manuscript Title: DETERMINATION OF READING ANXIETY OF PRIMARY SCHOOL 4TH GRADE STUDENTS	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Yes	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

The abstract clearly presents partially objects, methods and results. • *"Çeliktürk (2015)", this should be checked (in the References).* • *"Eskişehir", this should be checked.*	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. • *"...we can see…"* In the text, do not use the first person "we".	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The study methods are partially explained clearly. • *"Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı districts of Eskişehir", these should be checked.* • *"Çeliktürk (2015)", this should be checked (in the References).* • *"the SPSS 18.0 program", Reference should be given.* • *"Table 1", this should be checked.* • *"Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) (1960)", this should be checked (in the References).* • *"the Lisrel™ program", Reference should be given.* • *"$0.05 \leq SRMR \leq 0.10$", this should be checked.* • *"Kolmogorov and Smirnov Test Statistics (1960)", Reference should be given.*	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The body of the paper is partially clear and does not contain errors. • *These are given on Draft Word.*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusions or summary are partially accurate and supported by the content. • *These are given on Draft Word.*	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
The references are partially comprehensive and appropriate. • *All works cited in the text must be listed in the References.* • *Be sure to use the APA citation style in your paper. Check the following link https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_style_introduction.html* • *These are given on Draft Word.*	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
- Other corrections are given on Draft Word.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
- Other corrections are given on Draft Word.