



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES ( EJES )

**Paper: “A Critical Review of the Plight of Teenage Pregnant Girls Displaced by the COVID-19 Pandemic in Namibian Schools”**

**Submitted: 30 September 2023**

**Accepted: 01 March 2024**

**Published: 31 March 2024**

Corresponding Author: Anna Niitembu Hako

Doi: [10.19044/ejes.v11no1a32](https://doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v11no1a32)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

---

# ***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 Revised Manuscript Received: 30/01/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/02/2024
<b>Manuscript Title: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE PLIGHT OF TEENAGE PREGNANT GIRLS DISPLACED BY THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN NAMIBIAN SCHOOLS</b>	
Manuscript Number: 06.03.2024-EJES	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	5
The corrected title is more clear.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	5
In general, the abstract is clear, well presents the structure of the paper. The spelling of keywords should be standardized (uppercase or lowercase): <b>T</b> eenager pregnancy, <b>L</b> ife skills, <b>g</b> ender-based violence, <b>s</b> exual abuse, <b>g</b> irls' empowerment, <b>g</b> irls' education	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	OK
Minor errors have been corrected.	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	3
The section "Methodological considerations" was corrected. Now it is clearer how, in what way the literature sources under consideration were collected, in what way they were analyzed (thematic analysis). However, the meaning of one sentence remains vague: Baumeister and Leary (1997) conducted a review that synthesised these data (what data?) and critically analysed the strengths and shortcomings of individual research. I would appreciate if you could present the thoughts of these authors more accurately. Their thoughts are very important in justifying a narrative literature review.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	4
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	4
The recommendations were specified, and the conclusions were expanded. A wider range of topics has emerged as the focus of future research.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	4
The literature list was supplemented with sources that ground the methodology part.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation)

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I appreciate your work and the effort you put into editing the manuscript.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Significant corrections have been made and the manuscript looks much more strong.

# ***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 Revised Manuscript Received: 30/01/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/02/2024
<b>Manuscript Title: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE PLIGHT OF TEENAGE PREGNANT GIRLS DISPLACED BY THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC IN NAMIBIAN SCHOOLS</b>	
Manuscript Number: 06.03.2024-EJES	
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><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	5
The corrected title is more clear.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	5
In general, the abstract is clear, well presents the structure of the paper. The spelling of keywords should be standardized (uppercase or lowercase): <b>T</b> eenager pregnancy, <b>L</b> ife skills, <b>g</b> ender-based violence, <b>s</b> exual abuse, <b>g</b> irls' empowerment, <b>g</b> irls' education	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	OK
Minor errors have been corrected.	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	3
The section "Methodological considerations" was corrected. Now it is clearer how, in what way the literature sources under consideration were collected, in what way they were analyzed (thematic analysis). However, the meaning of one sentence remains vague: Baumeister and Leary (1997) conducted a review that synthesised these data (what data?) and critically analysed the strengths and shortcomings of individual research. I would appreciate if you could present the thoughts of these authors more accurately. Their thoughts are very important in justifying a narrative literature review.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	4
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	4
The recommendations were specified, and the conclusions were expanded. A wider range of topics has emerged as the focus of future research.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	4
The literature list was supplemented with sources that ground the methodology part.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation)

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I appreciate your work and the effort you put into editing the manuscript.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Significant corrections have been made and the manuscript looks much more strong.