

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. Susan Poyo	
Date Manuscript Received: 11-02-2018	Date Review Report Submitted: 11-10-2018
Manuscript Title: Student Academic Engagement Levels and Satisfaction with School Design: Correlations	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 114.10.2018	
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 on the ESJ's website: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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
<i>The paper focuses on determining and reporting both teachers' and students' engagement and satisfaction. Additionally, there is much emphasis on author generation of a valid and reliable instrument to measure these. "The ultimate goal was to develop instruments that when completed will act as tools for architectural firms..." (p. 3) The title ought to reflect this particularly as it may broaden your reading audience.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Often the abstract is what generates interest and purpose for reading the entire article. Is it possible to create a better flow of information that tells your story from problem to solution?</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Grammatical mistakes such as the first sentence of Introduction should be “This research team...” (p.2), on page 4 the cluster analyses are of the teachers’ and students’ responses or are you actually analyzing the participants? On p. 8, Table 2, check the actual question stem “At the end of the day, did the design of the built environment contribute (not contributed) to...”. May be a mistake in the table. There are other mistakes like these throughout.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The subtitles are very helpful</i>	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This research is very important for the field, particularly as we embrace active learning classrooms (ALC) in K-12 and Higher Education. Faculty in Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) need data demonstrating the value of ALC on student engagement and achievement. I would ask that you revisit your title, the Abstract and the RQ. The abstract is choppy, would benefit from an approach the begins with the problem and purpose, a generalized statement of the methodology and main finding, then end with next step. The RQ does not reflect the full perspective of your paper. Consider an additional RQ relative to the “ultimate goal” of creating a survey instrument. This may offer more audience for your paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

