

Paper: “Integrating English for Academic Writing Virtual Lab Setting in Pre-Service Math and Science Teacher Education Programs”

Submitted: 02 December 2021

Accepted: 20 January 2022

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Haggag Mohamed Haggag

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n2p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Mohamed Elnaggar
Egyptian E-Learning University, Egypt

Reviewer 3: Mauro Rivas
Universidad de Granada, España

Reviewer 4: Barbara Cappuzzo
University of Palermo, Italy

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: Mohamed Elnaggar	Email:
University/Country: Egyptian E-Learning University / Egypt	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/12/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/12/2021
Manuscript Title: Integrating English for Academic Writing Virtual Lab Setting in pre-service Math and Science Teacher Education Programs	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 54.12.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.	5
<i>The title clearly highlights the variables and sample of the research The topic is very important in English teaching field, and there is lack of the studies that employing technology in English teaching</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is clear containing the most important parts of the research summary but need to put one or two sentences about the application of virtual lab.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No grammatical or spelling mistakes noticed</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study used Quasi-experimental method with its procedures, but need more clarifications about the training processes (how the researcher proceeds in Virtual lab?)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results are clear and statistical manipulations are suitable to the hypotheses There are no statistical errors noticed in the study results.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusion and discussion of the study is related to the theoretical framework and results of the study, but I prefer to employ learning theories in the conclusion as constructivism, behavioral, communication theories ... etc,</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>references are comprehensive and appropriate, and the researcher employed the new literatures in the field for the study</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study needs some elaborations about the implementation (how did you used and employed virtual lab and the used tools and procedures of implementation)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The study is very useful for the field of English teaching methods, which employed e-training and education technology in developing academic writing for non-English specialty teachers.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 2021-12-23	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021-12-29
Manuscript Title: Integrating English for Academic Writing Virtual Lab Setting in pre-service Math and Science Teacher Education Programs	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 54.12.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	3
This rather could be referred to: “Effects of Academic Writing Virtual Lab Setting in pre-service Math and Science Teacher”. Because it is what mainly reports this paper.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
This is not referred clearly to the instruments applied in the research reported.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
It is necessary a total revision to remove a lot of errors and writing mistakes in this manuscript	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<p>A more explicit exposition to the methodological and contextual part of the research is missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What methodology (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, ...)? - Definition of variables, criteria or measurement system, and / or indicators. - Specific description of the sample selection procedure - Description of the sample - Delimit the instruments to those actually used in the investigation reported in this paper - Describe in detail the instruments (quantitative, qualitative and/or mixed, if it is the case) - Describe the data analysis techniques - If you go to use qualitative data, you should must show these and their respective analysis. 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the results are wrongly deduced - Some uses of the applied statistical models are not correct 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
It could be improved according to the improvement of the above	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
There are a lot of style mistakes in "Reference" section. Review according to APA Style.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript's subject is very interesting, it is necessary to do the changes proposed. I have include manuscript's file with some recommendations directly over text.

Other particular recommendations:

- Inadequate reference of tables in the text
- Persistent use of numbers in parentheses without this being necessary
- Make proper use of formal aspects for the development of this type of work.

- In general, it is necessary to review the manuscript with the author Guidelines

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Even though a detail review was not necessary I could not avoid to do it. The attached file has the results of that review. This should be given to the author.

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: Barbara Cappuzzo	
University/Country: Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: December 3, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: January 15, 2022
Manuscript Title: Integrating English for Academic Writing Virtual Lab Setting in pre-s Math and Science Teacher Education Programs	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1254/21	
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[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 fits the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is clear.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are a few grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods are clear.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are very well described.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are accurate.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4,5
The references are comprehensive. Punctuation is sometimes missing.	

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):

The study is well-structured and provides interesting results. The language is not always fluent and there are a few grammar mistakes. Linguistic revision is recommended.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: