

Paper: “Enhancing Primary Schoolchildren’s Autonomy and Interest towards Reading through Inquiry-based Activities and Digital Applications (A Case of Georgian Private School)”

Submitted: 07 March 2022

Accepted: 26 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Irina Chikovani

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p172](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p172)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arlinda Ymeraj
European University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Antonella Giacosa
University of Torino, Italy

Reviewer 3: Amaya Epelde Larranaga
University of Granada, Spain

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract describe the objects, while needs some clarification to the description of the purpose of the research. Methods are clearly presented, while results are missing. These comments are formulated with truck changes in the article.

Comments to abstract: Paragraphs have to be distinguished from each other, the author has to clearly mention the research purpose, the relevance or importance of the work, and the main outcomes.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Very few grammatical errors. In general, the article is written in a clear and concise manner.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly. The methods are relevant to the type of the research, presented in the article.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is also clear and does not contain errors. However, there are too many tables and figures. Perhaps, there is a possibility to summarize or to extract the most interesting and significant evidence.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are accurate, however a bit long. I sugest that some part have to be moved to the section of "discussions".

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There are no further suggestions, with exception to what was mentioned above. Comments are formulated also within the paper.

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is adequate and clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear and well-written

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The language is accurate (there is a typo in the keywords)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are clearly explained. However, further details on the kind of inquiry-based activities could increase the impact of the article on practitioners

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper is well-organized and interesting

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are accurate and address the research questions.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author(s),
I really appreciated your interesting article.
Best regards
the reviewer

Reviewer I:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

In the abstract, it is necessary to add the objectives of the study and the most notable conclusions.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is necessary to talk about the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, because it is an instrument developed by the researchers themselves.

Also, It is necessary to talk about the ethical procedure used. It is about minors, parental and government permissions.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

In general, the work is well done, but the discussion is very small, it is only compared with two researches. The discussion should be expanded.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The information that is presented in the discussion should not be repeated in the conclusions. The two sections must be distinguished. And also, it must be differentiated from the results, that is, do not repeat the results in the conclusions.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are appropriate, but APA regulations are not met in references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To improve the article, it is advisable to take into account the suggestions written in the attached text.
