

**Paper: “Challenges Caused by the COVID-19 Quarantine for Families Raising Children with Disabilities: Compatibility Between Working from Home and Childcare”**

**Submitted: 21 July 2021**

**Accepted: 02 October 2021**

**Published: 31 October 2021**

Corresponding Author: Agota Giedre

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p22](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p22)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Noor Alam  
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Reviewer 2: Nasreen Khan  
SZABIST, Dubai

Reviewer 3: Paul Waithaka  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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 Nasreen Khan	
University/Country: SZABIST Dubai, UAE	
Date Manuscript Received: 1/9/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/9/2021
Manuscript Title: CHALLENGES CAUSED BY THE COVID-19 QUARANTINE FOR FAMILIES RAISING CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES: COMPATIBILITY BETWEEN WORKING FROM HOME AND CHILDCARE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0807/21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Yes)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Yes)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(Proof reading is recommended)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Yes)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Yes)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Add discussion, limitations and future research direction)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Yes)</i>	

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

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

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

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

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: Paul Waithaka	
University/Country: Kenyatta University/Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 1/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 7/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Challenges Caused by The Covid-19 Quarantine for Families Raising Children with Disabilities: Compatibility Between Working from Home and Childcare	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0807/21	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Ok	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Data is said to have been collected using a semi-structured interview? This may require clarification	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
Ok	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Ok	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
The reference list seems too congested	

**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):**

- 1) Ensure citations comply with requirements e.g. on the second line of the paper is a citation Durosini et al., (2020). In the first instance all the authors should be introduced then the use of et al., is acceptable any subsequent time
- 2) Some paragraphs in the paper are too long. Shorten them appropriately

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