

Paper: **“Designing An Instrument For Gauging Equity Literacy”**

Submitted: 21 September 2022

Accepted: 14 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: N. K. Rathee

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Sept 29	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Designing an instrument for gauging equity literacy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 21.10.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No 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.	5
<i>The title clearly describes the article's content</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>Abstract is missing key components such as objectives, methods and results (preliminary).</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Article written with very few grammatical errors or spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Author fails to clearly state study based on secondary (literature review).</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Preliminary results is suggested to be placed for readers.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Acceptable based on the preliminary results.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References are appropriate.</i>	

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):

Topic is relevant and of great importance especially in educational settings. Method/Results section in need of improvement (informing reader of preliminary results being reported). Recommendations needed to strengthen paper as well as limitations of the study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper is well written but missing substantive results/conclusions as reporting preliminary results. Topic is relevant and of great importance especially in educational settings. Method/Results section in need of improvement (informing reader of preliminary results being reported). Recommendations needed to strengthen paper as well as limitations of the study.