

Paper: “Challenges of Online Teaching during the pandemic COVID-19: Reports from Moldovan Vocational Education and Training Teachers”

Submitted: 24 August 2020

Accepted: 02 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Paula E. Faulkner

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n34p195

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sahar Abboud Alameh
Beirut Arab University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Jelena Zascerinska
Centre for education and Innovation Research, Latvia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Sahar Abboud Alameh

University/Country:Lebanon

Date Manuscript Received:24/8/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/8/2020
Manuscript Title: Challenges of Online Teaching during the pandemic COVID-19: Reports from Moldovan Vocational Education Training Teachers	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0926/20	
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.	2
<i>Refer to my attached comments in the study)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
For a research paper, an abstract typically answers these questions : Purpose: What is the nature of your topic/study and why did you do it? Methods: What did you do , and how? Results: What were your most important findings? Refer to my comments.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1

<i>Refer to my comments in the study</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This study does not follow the structure and format of the APA style. <i>Some ideas are vague.</i> <i>Some titles are missed.</i> <i>Your body need to be more focused, well developed, and organized.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(the conclusions were not new for the education field.</i> <i>How these conclusion help in the future?)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(but do not follow APA style)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Please refer to my comments in the study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The results of this study are not very interesting, new, or helpful. I do not think this study will be a great addition to the education field. The researchers seem to be novice in the field of publication or research.

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. Jelena Zascerinska	
University/Country: Centre for education and Innovation Research, Latvia	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 September 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 September 2020
Manuscript Title: Challenges of Online Teaching during the pandemic COVID-19: Reports from Moldovan Vocational Education Training Teachers	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0926/20	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title is clear and well-formulated.	

<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The object of the paper (differs from the objective of the study) is not presented.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper is not well-written: misprints, a non-finished sentence, long sentences, not clearly formulated sentences, grammar mistakes, etc.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are indicated. However, the methods are permanently repeated without any further clarification or connectedness to the research. Methods of data analysis are not shown. The sample of 18 participants is pointed. However, below Table 2, 19 participants are announced.</p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The body is clear. However, the analysis is missing. The paper style mostly refers to the journalist style. This conclusion is also confirmed by the author(s) selection of references which are not mostly scientific references but a collection of non-scientific publications. For example, Save the Children, USAID, etc.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper does not offer any scientific novelty in the field of vocational education. The list of resources is not a scientific contribution. Simple google search can show it without any further efforts. The conclusions are partly relevant to the content: racism was not discussed as an issue, but suddenly appears in the conclusions. No citation is admitted in the conclusion part. It should be done in the Introductory part. Not clear whether the conclusions belong to Collin's study or the paper authors. Recommendations are very simple and evident. The recommendations are not built on the conclusions: if paper refers to education, it should contain pedagogical recommendations; if the paper relates to policymaking, then it can offer some appropriate suggestions. If the author(s) wish(es) to propose the list of resources, then, the focus of the</p>	

body of the paper should reveal the theoretical analysis of use of such resources in other scientific sources. The inter-relation between the objective and paper body is not established as the paper objective does not exist.

It would be great to clarify in the recommendations where "...tools in place..." are meant: at school or teacher's home?

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

2

(Please insert your comments)

The author(s) selection of references does not refer to scientific ones. The list of references is represented by a collection of non-scientific publications such as Save the Children, USAID, etc.

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):

No extra comments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No extra comments