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: May 12, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: May 20, 2023
Manuscript Title: Learning amidst COVID-19: Pre-service teachers' perceptions, experiences, and challenges with online teaching and learning in Ghana	
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.	3
The title is partially clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. • *The title: "Learning amidst COVID-19: Pre-service teachers' perceptions, experiences, and challenges with online teaching and learning in Ghana"* • *"The purpose of this study was to examine pre-service teachers' perceptions, experiences,*	

and challenges with online teaching and learning" <mark>In the abstract part</mark> • *"the purpose of the study is to understand students' attitudes and experiences with online teaching, learning, and assessment, as well as how to best employ these tactics to improve efficacy, efficiency, and effectiveness"* <mark>In the Background part</mark>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract clearly presents <mark>*partially*</mark> *objects, methods and results.* • The abstract needs to be restructured so that it is suitable for scientific research and not in a form suitable for a thesis. The methodology is missing in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. • *"To work,* <mark>*you*</mark> *will need more than just mobile data*<mark>*; you*</mark> *will also need enough bandwidth with strong connection",* In the text, do not use the second person "<mark>you</mark>". • *"Teacher-*<mark>*tudents*</mark> *relationships…",* this should be checked.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The study methods are <mark>*partially*</mark> *explained clearly.* • *"*<mark>*(Creswell, 2003)*</mark>*",* this should be checked (in the References). • *"*<mark>*Siniscalco and Auriat (2005)*</mark>*",* this should be checked (in the References).	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	<mark>2</mark>
The body of the paper is <mark>*not*</mark> *clear and does not contain errors.* • *"26.*<mark>*7*</mark>*%",* this should be checked. • *"*<mark>*the respondents (71%)*</mark>*",* this should be checked. • *"Specifically,* <mark>*78% of the respondets*</mark>*",* this should be checked. • *"Again,* <mark>*130*</mark> *respondents",* this should be checked. • *"*<mark>*with 149 respondents indicated that*</mark>*. Also, insufficient band width and difficulty retrieving assessment results respectively as challenges",* this should be checked. • *"*<mark>*Table 2*</mark>*",* this should be checked. • *"*<mark>*Figure 1, 2*</mark>*",* this should be checked.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusions or summary are <mark>*partially*</mark> *accurate and supported by the content.* • <mark>*(Totaro et al., 2005)*</mark>*,* this should be checked (in the References). • *"*<mark>*Sanli (2003)*</mark>*",* this should be checked (in the References). • <mark>*(Hong et al., 2003)*</mark>*",* this should be checked (in the References).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3

> *The references are <mark>partially</mark> comprehensive and appropriate.*
> - *All works cited in the text must be listed in the References.*

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<mark>X</mark>
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Other corrections are given [on <mark>Draft Word</mark>].

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Other corrections are given [on <mark>Draft Word</mark>].

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: 11/07	Date Review Report Submitted:14/07
Manuscript Title: Learning amidst COVID-19: Pre-service teachers' perceptions, experiences, and challenges with online teaching and learning in Ghana	
Manuscript Number:12.10.2023	
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.	**4**
The title is long but clear. As it is a case study I would point it out.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The abstract is clear, brief and overall effective. It would benefit from a last sentence to conclude it referring to the impact of this study.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
The language is clear and accurate. pag. 10 "Table 2 reveals that the acquisition of new technical skills through the use of online teaching and assessment, positive impact of online learning on academic performance, and online teaching and learning assist students to set their own schedule, had high appraisals". The sentence is long and not very clear.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The methodology is clear. This section could be improved by hinting at possible limitations of the study.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
I think that RQ 3 (What are experiences of students towards online teaching, learning, and assessment?) is unnecessary or should be considered as a main Research question, which could be broken into the smaller, more specific and manageable questions you have already found. I think that the article could be improved by adding the heading "Literature review" to the section where different research papers are mentioned. There is a major problem regarding terminology: you mistakenly call the educational experiences had during the pandemic "e-learning". You should rather refer to the unplanned shift of education to online platforms as Emergency, Remote Education (see section 7) Minor problems: Figures 1 and 2: why don't you use the percentages? Finally, you should make it more explicit that some issues of concern for education had already been raised before the pandemic. It is unsettling to read your lines referring to what happened to the pandemic and see that some of the papers you are referring to date back to 2008, 2016, etc. The problem is due to the fact that you do not make a difference between e-learning and ERT.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Although your case study refers to a single country, it is part of a a global phenomenon. Therefore, it would be interesting to generalize a bit more and specify how this paper could contribute to the body of knowledge of ERT. Drawing on the experience of Ghanaian you are able to say something relevant for pre-service teachers studying in other countries (For this reason I do not think that Ghana is a necessary keyword).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
I think that you need to consider these papers to focus on the difference between e-learning and ERT: Bozkurt, A. Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirschi, V., Schuwer, R., Egorov, Gennady, L., Sarah R., AlFreih, M., Pete, J., Olcott, D., Rodes, V., Aranciaga, I., Bali, M., Alvarez, A., Roberts, J., Pazurek, A., Raffaghelli, J. E., Panagiotou, N., de Coetlogon, P. … & Paskevicius, M. (2020). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15(1), 1-126. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3778083;	

Giacosa, A. (2020). Can Emergency Remote Education make our universities "smarter"? Some reflections based on students' perceptions. Proceedings- Didamatica Aica 2020, Atti convegno nazionale- Trieste, 198-206. ISBN: 978-8-89-809161-4

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., Bond, A. (2020, March 27). The Difference between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning. Educause Review. Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emerge;

Radić, N.(2021). COVID-19 emergency teaching: from CULP to remote CULP. In N. Radić, A. Atabekova, M. Freddi, & J. Schmied(Eds),, The world universities' response to COVID-19: remote online language teaching. (pp. 337-351). Research-publishing.net. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2021.52.9782490057924).

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):

I really liked your article and I think that it can be published after minor revisions.