



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

Paper: **“Systematic Review of International Student Mobility in Higher Education”**

**Submitted: 22 December 2023**

**Accepted: 29 February 2024**

**Published: 31 March 2024**

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Cankaya

Doi: [10.19044/ejes.v11no1a54](https://doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v11no1a54)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Fathi Shamma

# ***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:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Systematic Review of International Student Mobility in Higher Education</b>	
Manuscript Number:	
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: <b>Yes</b> /No	
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>	4
<i>Clear enough</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	2
<i>The object of the study should be more clarified The sample is not there No clear results</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	2
<i>The paper needs proofreading</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	4
<i>Explained clearly</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	3
<i>It sounds good and comprehensive</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	3
<i>the conclusions are to long and parts of it are repeated</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	4
<i>Well done</i>	

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

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

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

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



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES  
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

