



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

Paper: **“Development of the Jefferson Scale of Empathy for Teachers (JSE-T) to Measure Empathy in Educationally Relevant Situations”**

Submitted: 16 January 2023

Accepted: 28 September 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Christoph M. Paulus

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v10no2a169

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Luka Pongracic

University of Slavonski Brod, Croatia

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: 12.9.2023.	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.9.2023.
Manuscript Title: Development of the Jefferson Scale of Empathy for Teachers (JSE-T) to measure empathy in educationally relevant situations	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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.	5
The title is clear and corresponds to the content of the article. It gives clear indications of what the article is about and corresponds to the research conducted.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The summary clearly describes the content of the article and the contents that are described. It is necessary to additionally explain which methodological problems are involved.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>The article uses grammatically and orthographically correct English. It lacks a bit of scientific discourse, it has flaws such as the use of the word "we" in the conclusion and some parts of the paper.</p> <p>To investigate the convergent validity in the sense of the correlations of the factors with the SPF scales, we in investigated a second CFA model (Model 3) in which the SPF's scales EC and PT were taken into account</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is clearly and precisely explained. Relevant scientific literature was used.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p>The order is clear in the paper, but there is still a lack of scientific discourse. Terms like: we calculated We made use</p> <p>Tables 3, 4 and 5 are merged. Tables should be placed after the paragraph in which the content is described.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
The conclusion is too short and does not provide a description and explanation of the results obtained from the research.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The literature is relevant and comprehensive.	

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):

The use of personal pronouns should be avoided in the article. A higher level of scientific discourse should be achieved. This article is an excellent scientific contribution, it deals with the topic of empathy, which is current. The introduction talks a lot about the medical field, while the scale is in the school context, so it would be good to achieve a little more pedagogical context in the introductory part of the article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article provides a valuable scientific contribution and I suggest that it be published after changes.



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