

Manuscript: “**Assessment of Perception and Perspective of Video Games on the Children: A Case Study of Tirana, Albania**”

Submitted: 01 December 2020

Accepted: 21 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Pranvera Troka

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p224

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Xhevaire Dulja, Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Hadi Sutopo, Kalbis Institute, Indonesia

Reviewer 3: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo, Université Des Mascareignes, Mauritius

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: Xhevaire Dulja	Email:
University/Country: Agricultural University of Tirana/Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.12.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.12.2020
Manuscript Title: Assessment of perception and perspective of video games on the children	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1269/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

<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
Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract represent well the content of the article including all the sections:	

objectives, methodology, results and conclusions.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Yes, there are some grammatical mistakes to be addressed and corrected. Some revision on sentence structure needed</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>According to my revision the methodology has to be shorten. there is some repetition of information</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Results are accurate and are presented correctly in the article. I'd suggest that results be more visible as a separated section (Results and discussions).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Yes, the conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The article is supported by the references as a product of careful documentation.	

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):

Please consult the comments on the previous table

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: Hadi Sutopo	Email:
University/Country: Kalbis Institute - Indonesia	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/01/2021
Manuscript Title: Assessment of perception and perspective of video games on the children	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69/12/2020	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Add the research method clearly, is it an experiment or case study?</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Be careful using present tense and past tense.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Add citation.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>There is not any discussion of the research.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Add citation to ensure and confirm the conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Writing the internet resources is not correct. Check APA reference style and use Mendeley reference management</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research is interesting and can be improved.

Add with prior research, and what is the novelty of this research

What are the advantages of this research

What are the disadvantages if this research is not conducted

1.2 Submission of the problem

Evaluation of children's perceptions and perspectives of computer games has received little attention in studies and research literature.

- need citation

In our country lacks the scientific studies that have focused on the perception and perspective of children, aged 7-14 years on the PlayStation computer games in Tirana

- need citation or survey

2.1 Research method

The research method used in the study is the qualitative method of data collection, analysis and interpretation.

- need citation

3. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

- should be split into two title

3. DISCUSSION

This part of paper describes research detailed based on research method, includes:

- Questionnaires, what kind of questions that was designed
- Answer, what are the most answers of the questions
- Interviews, since it is a qualitative research, it will be interesting if researcher describe how to make coding and process the data,
- Is there any photo or video data? Image and video data are the important data in qualitative research
- Is there any document published by government, journal or website?
- How to integrate the variety data to be processed?
- Do you use qualitative software to process and analyze data?
- Provide the discussion with chart, the chart can be generated using qualitative data software.

References

The resources from internet do not be separated from printed books or journal.

Writing internet sources are not correct. Please see the guide in APA reference style.

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: Nirmal Kumar BETCHOO	Email:
University/Country: Université des Mascareignes, MAURITIUS	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/01/2021
Manuscript Title: Assessment of perception and perspective of video games on the children	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1269/20	
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.

<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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Good title but could be adapted to New Tirana in Albania. This needs to be mentioned as it looks a bit general.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Good but I prefer a single paragraph. Please do so.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are no major errors as seen from the paper provided.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> They are clear but need some more specification.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> They look a bit general as the findings are not supported by data.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I am arguing why the last 3 paragraphs are in bullet form. They should be in a paragraph.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> OK	

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):

A good paper. I have improved the abstract and made a few corrections. For the 3 final sub-chapters, please use sentence form although recommendations could be individual like a) b) c) etc. I would also like to see better account of findings as they are a bit brief.