

Paper: “**Education 4.0 and Teachers: Challenges, Risks and Benefits**”

Submitted: 19 October 2020

Accepted: 07 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Zoe Karanikola

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n34p114

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: S. Sendilvelan

Dr. M.G.R. Educational and Research Institute, India

Reviewer 2: Fernando Espinoza

Hofstra University, USA

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: Fernando Espinoza	Email:
University/Country: Hofstra University/USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/1/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/2/2020
Manuscript Title: Education 4.0 and Teachers: Challenges, Risks and Benefits	
ESJ 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.

<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a few stylistic issues, especially concerning the references, as pointed out in the body of the text.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>There are several issues with the authors' conclusion section (as indicated in the text); there needs to be more discussion of the affective features of the responses on page 9, particularly as they are deemed to be statistically significant.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>I believe more information needs to be included in the discussion to support the</i>	

claims made.

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):

My comments are included in the body of the text; the study is interesting and helpful to practitioners, but the narrative could benefit by more extensive discussion of some of the findings, particularly on page 9.

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: Dr. S. Sendilvelan	
University/Country: Dr. M.G.R. Educational and Research Institute	
Date Manuscript Received: 1 Dec	Date Review Report Submitted: 2 Dec
Manuscript Title: Education 4.0 and Teachers: Challenges, Risks and Benefits	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1122/20	
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
Title Clear	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract is generic author must tell the methods used and core conclusions	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Manuscript should be checked for errors in gramers	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
yes	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
yes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Modified and rewritten	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
5 years old reference should be removed include new references	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Check the box

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
After the correction manuscript can be approved**