

Manuscript: “**Assessing the Achievement Testing Practices of Teachers in Junior High Schools in the Sissala East Municipality of Ghana**”

**Submitted: 06 April 2021**

**Accepted: 18 June 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: Andrews Cobbinah

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n23p190

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Jingshun Zhang  
Florida Gulf Coast University, USA

**Reviewer 2:** Dr. Jelena Zascerinska  
Centre for Education and Innovation Research, Latvia

# *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: Jingshun Zhang	Email: jzhang@fgcu.edu
University/Country: Florida Gulf Coast University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 4/12/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 4/15/2021
Manuscript Title: ASSESSING THE PRACTICE OF ACHIEVEMENT TESTING IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE SISSALA EAST MUNICIPALITY OF GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Assessment of <b>Teacher</b> .....	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Not too many Grammatical error</i> <b>However, the writing need to improve and follow the APA</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Need one section as Literature review.</li> <li>■ APA 6 or 7?</li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Some parts need more information in details such as the sampling process, response rate, Why all items got 100% responses from 248 ??! It is too perfect. Please double check</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Some results need to discuss more in details</b>	
<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 discussion needs to be enhanced.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Some are not in APA</b> <b>Some references need to updated new</b> <b>Some citations and references need the first hand literature support</b>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- It is a interesting topic.
- Authors need to revise it according to the APA format
- Some parts need to provide information in details
- Some parts are not very clear

# ***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: <b>Dr. Jelena Zascerinska</b>	
University/Country: <b>Centre for Education and Innovation Research/ Latvia</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>11 June 2021</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>14 June 2021</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>ASSESSING THE PRACTICE OF ACHIEVEMENT TESTING IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE SISSALA EAST MUNICIPALITY OF GHANA</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>64.04/21</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## **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>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b><i>The use of “Assessing” in the title is misleading as even the authors in the manuscript stress that only self-reporting is presented. Otherwise, it should be emphasized who assess what.</i></b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The abstract is based on the manuscript text. As the manuscript text lacks some up to date information, the abstract does not reflect the missing information, too.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The abstract and the manuscript text contain some grammar mistakes. For example, it should be “data were”, “test scoring”, etc</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The study methods are not fully explained as the selection of the employed methods is not justified. Theoretical methods could be introduced as well.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The received results limited by the methodology of the empirical study are clearly presented.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The conclusions are supported by the content. However, the conclusions are not substantially described: limits of the research, implications and future research direction are not indicated.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The references are outdated, the newest refers to 2010, today is 2021. In-text citation does not coincide with the list of references.</b>	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Thanks to the authors for the interesting and well-structured paper.

However, the authors do not point the novelty of the contribution. The absence of the paper novelty together with the outdated data and references do not allow defining the importance, relevance and urgency of the carried out research:

- Why is it important in 2021 to publish the results of the study implemented in 2010 as the situation in the country and teacher professional development has significantly changed since then?
- Why is it important in 2021 when the testing practice has moved to the fully digital format due to COVID-19 to describe the non-digitalized testing practice used in 2010?

These are only a few of the questions.