



**Paper: “Gender-Related Differential Item Functioning of 2015 Wassece Core Mathematics Results in Southern Ghana Using Logistic Regression Procedure”**

Corresponding Author: Ruth Annan Brew

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p188

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oribhabor Chinelo Blessing  
University of Africa Toru-Orua Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Published: 30.06.2020

# ***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: Oribhabor Chinelo Blessing Ph. D.	email:
University/Country: University of Africa Toru-Orua Bayelsa State/ Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 April, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 5 May, 2020
Manuscript Title: GENDER-RELATED DIFFERENTIAL ITEM FUNCTIONING OF 2015 WASSCE CORE MATHEMATICS RESULTS IN SOUTHERN GHANA USING LOGISTIC REGRESSION PROCEDURE	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number:</b> 0535/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, there are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>In the method- Line 10, the researcher should delete ‘Mantel Haenszel method’ because the research did not use the method in the study</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
In the ‘Introduction’- paragraph 2 which starts with ‘Notwithstanding’... should be merged with paragraph 1.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The conclusion is good</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Dorans & Holand (1993) was cited in the work <b>but not referenced</b> . The researcher should write it in the reference page.	

**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 researchers should do the necessary corrections pointed in the table.

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