

Paper: “A Proposed Artificial Intelligence-Based System for Developing E-management Skills in Saudi Primary Schools”

Submitted: 19 March 2023

Accepted: 28 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Ahlam Hagag

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n11p111

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohamed Agwa

The National Egyptian E-Learning University (EELU), Egypt

Reviewer 2: Murry Siyasiya

Malawi Institute of Journalism; and Blantyre International University, Malawi

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Please add "and its result's analysis" to the title, since the author indeed did a lot of analysis of the system.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It is clear enough for the objects and methods but not the results. The author should include some of the key results in the abstract.

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

I correct a few pages, but I feel it's best to let the authors hire professional editors to do so. The paper was well-written, but for the term "leader," I feel the author should consider using "administrator" or "administration" instead.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

1. In the methodology session, the authors mentioned the "descriptive approach" and "quasi-experimental approach." They should at least have one sentence following and explain it further. For example, in descriptive analytics, corresponding to Figure 4, I understood the authors tried to say descriptive statistics from the data, including bar charts, pie charts, line plots, etc. They should be more specific about what visualization and statistical values they used.

2. The figures only contain Arabic languages; there should be English captions.

3. Different significant figures were used; please use the same format for all the numerical values.

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

No, there are no errors.

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

I think the author used the wrong session title, which should be "conclusion" and not "discussion." The content supports the discussion. Please change the session title.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

the authors should add more references in a couple of places where I left comments in the edited document.

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]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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 M:

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.

Fair

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.

Yes

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

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]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study did not specify the objectives. I had to skim through it more than twice to grasp what the researchers wanted to achieve. By reading the topic, I expected that the researchers would do the following:

- 1) Explain how they developed the system
- 2) Present the developed and proposed system to the reader
- 2) Provide feedback from users of the system.

Item 1) would have formed part of Methodology while 2) and 3) Results.

Reviewer P:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

See my comments in the Word file

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

See my comments in the Word file

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

See my comments in the Word file

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

See my comments in the Word file

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

See my comments in the Word file

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

See my comments in the Word file

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

See my comments in the Word file

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

1

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See my comments in the Word file
