

Paper: “Improving Learning Experience of People with Cognitive Disabilities Using Serious Games: A Review”

Submitted: 30 August 2021

Accepted: 22 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Md. Ashraful Islam (Rajib)

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p166](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p166)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Vladutescu Stefan
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: 07/09	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/09
Manuscript Title: ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 42.09.2021	
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.	3
The title is very general. A subtitle could help the reader to understand the aim and the scope of the study more easily.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

The abstract is clear and well-written but there seems to be a major problem either with the phrasing of the results or the methodology itself. The author first states a qualitative method will be used, but then quantitative results are mentioned (higher level of stress).	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The methodology should be explained in more detail. Were only questionnaires used? What kind of questions did they contain? Open questions for the qualitative analysis?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
It is not clear where the Result section begins (what is the section Social media? Is it the Background of your study?). It is not well explained how the qualitative study leads to the presented results.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
The results do not mention the age of the participants but then in the conclusions the author refers to level of stress for the youth. It is not self-evident why a paragraph is devoted to the policies against the infodemic; it should be explained more clearly.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The references should be improved by separating the websites from the other references.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topic is very interesting but major changes are needed:

The methodology should be more clearly explained; the results should be explained by referring to the method of analysis.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The topic chosen is timely and interesting, but the article needs major changes concerning the methodology and the presentation of the findings. At present I do not think it can be published.

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: 06.09.2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0942/21	
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: 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.	4
<i>Title is enough for the study.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>There is enough information about objects, methods and results of the study in the abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method is well explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are enough but discussion of the findings might be strengthened by comments on the reasons and results.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusion is supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are enough.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	XXX
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: Stefan Vladutescu	
University/Country: Univesrity of Craiova, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 7.09.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15.09.2021
Manuscript Title: ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 42.09.21	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The starting idea is challenging and is investigated with a validated method.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results and the discussion are worthwhile.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The bibliography must be completed with at least 2 more titles from 2021; from 2021 contains only one title.	

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):

Positive aspects

The manuscript is interesting; it addresses a topic of major interest at this time as well.

Negative aspects

The bibliography must be completed with at least 2 more titles from 2021; from 2021 contains only one title.

The manuscript does not include a "Future research" section; it would be beneficial for the future reader to know how the author thinks in the future the topic now in his attention.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

