

Manuscript: **“WhatsApp: Communication between Parents and Kindergarten Teachers in the Digital Era”**

Submitted: 05 February 2021

Accepted: 26 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Aviva Dan

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Prof. Dr. İsmail İpek, Istanbul Aydın University, Turkey

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/2/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/02/2021
Manuscript Title: "WhatsApp": Communication between parents and kindergarten teachers in the digital era	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 64.02.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.	5
<i>The title corresponds with the content. No objections.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes, the abstract defines clearly the aims and methods of the research, and outlines</i>	

<i>the main findings</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Not exactly grammar errors but some language issues, such as sentence structure and word order, e.g.: doubled the in the Abstract; Demographic and background data – first paragraph; or in the paragraph on Collaboration model, last sentence; the Separation model – what is in brackets is not clear. Please check once more the language of the article and commas (language review is necessary).</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology of the research and the use of the questionnaire are explained and applied appropriately. The findings are interpreted well and in detail in the Results and Discussion section. The research questions appear also in the Discussion and Conclusion part, which is inappropriate. They should only be mentioned in the introduction to the research. Please make necessary changes.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The research results are summarized and clearly interpreted by the means of tables, The author makes correlations between the findings, so that the original research is enriched and makes it possible for the author to ask new questions. It can also serve as a basis for new research (e. g. comparison with other studies or other target groups). I have some objections to the paper form: The titles of the tables must be separated from the previous text, as well as subtitles should be separated from the previous text by one free line. Please check formatting.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusions are resulting from the research findings and are well elaborated. I have some objections on the placement of research questions in the Conclusion part. The questions do not belong here (they belong to the Introduction to the research, which was done, so here they are solely repeated). Please either delete them (my recommendation) or incorporate them into the text in another place/part.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The References do not have the required format. Please align the format with the APA style and unify the format.</i>	

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 article is **recommended for publication after small changes** indicated in the review. Please check my notes, do the language review in the indicated cases (minor mistakes) and submit the article anew.



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: Prof. Dr. İsmail İPEK	
University/Country: Istanbul Aydın University/TURKEY	
Date Manuscript Received: 18.03.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.03.2021
Manuscript Title: "WhatsApp": Communication between parents and kindergarten teachers in the digital era	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0264/21	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
There is no comment about the title.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is good enough to present process.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Ok.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results should be considered based on research questions and step by step better.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Summary and <u>conclusions</u> used two times. I think that summary should indicate research questions and present activities shortly.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
During this pandemic, authors should add new references and provide new publications better.	

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):

Thank you for your performances about this paper. I think that you should review and write conclusions for research problems step by step to make more easily readable and followable.