Paper: **"E-learning Challenges in the Era of Covid-19: The Georgian Case"**

Corresponding Author: Tamar Kakutia

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: James Nweah-Ackah Mochiah
Holy Child College of Education, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Ibraheem Alabi
Lagos State University of Education, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is clear. It fit the content of the article. That is good.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I did not see the ABSTRACT. Abstract was not part of the manuscript sent to me.

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

Check, the word internet used the article, even when appears in the middle of a sentence begins with capital "I".

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes the study methods were explained but I don't understand why the study was referred to as a qualitative research.

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

The body of the paper was clear and does not contain error.

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.

Some of the in text citation was not done well. For instance "(Laar, Alexander J. A. M., van Dijk, & de Haan, 2020" , going APA style, the should not be any initials. Also, after citing these authors for the first time, the subsequent once should have been like "Laar etal, 2020".
With the references, most of them were not done appropriately. Check the referencing, especially, "Delle 2020, Akende and Barmise 2017, Adedotun 2015, Bendeliani 2020, JISC 2016, Bartolo 2014", were all not properly referenced.
Lastly, OECD 2020 and University of Western Sunday 2020 were cited in the text but were not found in the references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

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]

2

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]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please read through the paper.
There should be ABSTRACT in your article. It is a requirement.
I suggest that the study is only "quantitative study".
Present the RESULTS section according to the your research questions stated.
Please check the referencing, some needs to be completed with other information and some needs few modification.
Please refer to the guideline of the Journal.

Reviewer J:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is apt and considerably okay.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is apt and considerably okay.

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

Very minimal error.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are reported to be mixed but only the quantitative method was discussed or examined. I do not see the qualitative aspect. It is advisable to expunge the qualitative if no data was collected on it.

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

The body of the paper is clear.

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

The conclusion is to be separated from the recommendation in order to show better clarity.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The are some omissions of details of authors on the reference page.

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]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

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!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is apt and good for publication after implementing the minor correction. If there is any way the authors can reduce the volume of the papers from 24 pages to something less than 20 pages, the authors should do. In particular, the paragraph of four to six lines seems to be short. A minimum of eight lines is preferable.

Reviewer M:
Recommendation: Decline Submission

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

Si, el título es claro

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Si, presenta con claridad objeto, método y resultados

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

No, la escritura es buena y sin errores.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Si, la metodoloía es cualitativa y cuantitativa, se basa en fuentes oficiales, muestras y estadísticas.

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

El cuerpo del artículo no contiene errores.

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

Si, el resumen se adecua perfectamente al cuerpo del trabajo

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Si, es completa y apropiada.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

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]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No es necesario