



Paper: “Relationship Between Metacognitive Skills and Information Processing Skills Among Al-Quds University Students”

Corresponding Author: Rimawi Omar

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p262

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olena Kovalchuk
National Technical University of Ukraine, Ukraine

Reviewer 2: Kelechi U. Lazarus
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Oribhabor Chinelo Blessing
University of Africa, Toru-Orua, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Reviewer 4: Raul Rocha Romero
Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ESJ 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.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Olena Kovalchuk	Email:
University/Country: Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs	
Date Manuscript Received: 25.05.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.05.2020
Manuscript Title: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METACOGNITIVE SKILLS AND INFORMATION PROCESSING SKILLS AMONG AL-QUDS UNIVERSITY STUDENTS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0581/20	
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 adequate to the content of the paper	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<p>The abstract clearly presents aim, objects and results. It would be better to indicate methods used in the research.</p> <p>Authors' response: We have added the method (Rational Descriptive Approach) to the abstract as recommended.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The paper is well-written in terms of grammar and vocabulary.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>Not only did the authors explain the study methods, they also tested them for validity and reliability. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to test the reliability and consistency of the study findings.</i></p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The body of the paper is quite clear. The authors use tables to illustrate the research data.</p> <p>I doubt the second hypothesis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no statistical significant differences at $\alpha \leq 0.05$ in metacognitive skills and information processing among Al-Quds University students according to gender, faculty and academic level. <p>The authors indicate the definite level of differences in the hypothesis.</p> <p>Authors' response: We have rephrased the second hypothesis omitting the ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) to be more general.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. The results are discussed.</p> <p>The authors stated that female students use metacognitive skills more than male students, as they are better than male students in terms of academic achievement and the desire to excel and obtain high academic grades.</p> <p>I would like to know the explanation of this result. Is it connected with the fact that there were more female students in comparison with male students? or is it connected with personal characteristics of female students?</p> <p>Authors' response: The above result is only connected with the personal</p>	

characteristics of the female students regardless their number in the sample of the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The references are comprehensive and appropriate, there are 24 references.	

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):

The paper is well written, well-structured and clear. I recommend this paper for publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ESJ 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.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Raúl Rocha Romero	
University/Country: México	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/07/2020
Manuscript Title: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METACOGNITIVE SKILLS AND INFORMATION PROCESSING SKILLS AMONG AL-QUDS UNIVERSITY STUDENTS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 81.05.2020	
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>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
<i>The title is clear. It involves the relationship between the two study variables and the population in which these variables are measured.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>The abstract contains the necessary elements about the content of the article</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The article is impeccable.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method is fine. Just one observation: the hypotheses presented are statistical hypotheses. It would be convenient to propose working or theoretical hypotheses. Furthermore, the hypotheses are not posed in a negative way.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>The theoretical content is brief, but it is well founded.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The conclusions are in line with what is stated throughout the article.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>There are four references that are not cited in the text.</i>	

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):

Pay attention to the few observations that are in the article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is very good. It is parsimonious and makes a good review of the relevant literature. There is only one observation in the hypotheses and the authors should check the four references that are not cited in the text. Everything else is excellent.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ESJ 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.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Oribhabor Chinelo Blessing	
University/Country: University of Africa, Toru-Orua, Bayelsa State./ Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: July 7, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: July 10, 2020
Manuscript Title: Relationship Between Metacognitive Skills and Information Processing Skills Among Al-Quds University Students	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0581/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

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.	4
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract is clear, though the author did not write the method of analysis	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
There are some clarifications. See annotated paper.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The body of the paper is clear, though contains a few errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
There are comments on how to improve the Discussion and Conclusions sections. See annotated paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
There are some corrections to be made at the reference page. See annotated paper.	
'Aljaf & Jani (2011)' was not referenced but it was cited in the body of the work, please, reference it.	

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):

Generally, the study is fine and valuable. Please, endeavor to do the necessary corrections so as to make the work better.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I agree with the author's type of submission