

Paper: “The Effectiveness of Using a Cognitive Style-based Chatbot in Developing Science Concepts and Critical Thinking Skills among Preparatory School Pupils”

Submitted: 14 June 2022

Accepted: 18 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Suzan Samir

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p52](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p52)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tarek Hegazy
The Egyptian E-learning University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Jelena Zascerinska
University of Latvia, Latvia

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

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

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

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

Text need to be plagiarized check

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

Sufficient

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

appropriate and compatible with APA style

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]

4

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]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

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

The article contains some misprints and spelling mistakes.
Particularly, the names of the cited authors differ in the text of the article and in the list of references. For example, Fyer or Fryer? etc

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained.

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

The body of the article is clearly and logically structured.

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

The CONCLUSION is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is a little bit outdated as the latest reference refers to 2020.
Today is the middle of 2022.
Some references are not cited in the text of the article, and some references are cited but not indicated in the list of references.
The names of the cited authors do not always coincide in the text and the list of references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research topic is relevant and important.

The article has 3 co-authors. However, in the text of the article only the word "researcher" is used.
