Paper: **"Pre-Service Science Teachers' Assessment of Supported Teaching in School"**

Corresponding Author: Isaac Sonful Coffie

# ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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!*

| | |
|---|---|
| Date Manuscript Received: 9/7/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 9/8/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: **LEARNING TO TEACH AND TEACHING TO LEARN: PRE-SERVICE SCIENCE TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT OF SUPPORTED TEACHING IN SCHOOL** | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 62.09.2021 | |
| 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<br><br>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.**

| *Questions* | *Rating Result*<br>[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **3** |
| *The title would be better as: Pre-Service Science Teachers' Assessment of Supported Teaching in School.* | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **3** |

| | |
|---|---|
| *The abstract was adequate but could have used more information such as the themes that were developed from the research questions.  Also, the types of documents were used would have been helpful. Then there coud have been more detailed information about the results.* | |
| **3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **3** |
| *There are some grammatical errors, spelling and use of APA guidelines.  These are highlighted.* | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **3** |
| *There is some confusion as to the instruments used and how they were used to develop the themes.  Needed more detail on the results and how the themes were determined.* | |
| **5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.** | **3** |
| *Based on a qualitative study, it would have been helpful to have organized the results by the themes and then show the comments listed that supported these themes.  I believe there may have been more information then was stated.  Also, were the demographics looked at and would this have impacted the results?* | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **3** |
| *There needs to be more conclusions based on the themes and the results of the themes.  For example, it would have been helpful to note how the results related to the current literature and was something found that was a gap in the research.  It would have been helpful to discuss how the results may have been different for the individual interview, focus group and the documentary anaysis.  I would also put a separate section for the recommedations.* | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | **3** |
| *There seem to be some references that are only on the reference list and not in the document.* | |

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

This was a good study, but needed to focus more on the results and how they would impact the program.  The population was small and the data came from different sources.  That was confusing.  See my comments and suggestions in the document.

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

# **ESJ** *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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. N. K. Rathee | |
| University/Country: Delaware State University, USA | |
| Date Manuscript Received: Sept 7, 2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: Sept. 11, 2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Learning to teach and teaching to learn: pre-service science teachers' assessment of supported teaching in school | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0962/21 | |
| 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<br><br>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.**

| *Questions* | *Rating Result*<br>[Poor] **1-5**<br>[Excellent] |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **5** |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Very appropriate title.* | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **5** |
| *Abstract meets the required standards.* | |
| **3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **5** |
| *Error free manuscript.* | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **5** |
| *Methods have been explained very well.* | |
| **5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.** | **5** |
| *Results are very clear.* | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **5** |
| *Conclusion supports the paper.* | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | **5** |
| *All required references have been provided.* | |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | **Yes** |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

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

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

# ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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: Mohamadou Bassirou Arabo | |
| University/Country:CAMEROON | |
| Date Manuscript Received:07.09.2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 12.09.2021 |
| Manuscript Title: **LEARNING TO TEACH AND TEACHING TO LEARN: PRE-SERVICE SCIENCE TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT OF SUPPORTED TEACHING IN SCHOOL** | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0962/21 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:      Yes/No   yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No     Yes<br><br>You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:  Yes/No          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.**

| *Questions* | *Rating Result*<br>[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **4** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> **There is a link between the title and the content** | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **4** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> **Essential elements appear in abstract** | |
| **3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **3** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> **Some errors need correction and the author should read again his paper for correction** | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **4** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> **Methods are clearly explained** | |
| **5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.** | **4** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> **Results are clear but some corrections needed** | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **4** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> **But conclusion is mixed with recommandations** | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | **4** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* <br> *References need rearangement* | |

## 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):

There is a link between the title and the content.Essential elements appear in abstract.Results are clear but some corrections needed.References need rearangement,only cited elements are important.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** the team is objective,because the criteria of evaluation respect universal norms.