

Paper: **“The Opportunity for Profit to College Student-Athletes Analysis Study”**

**Submitted: 17 February 2024**

**Accepted: 17 April 2024**

**Published: 30 April 2024**

Corresponding Author: Ezzeldin R. Aly

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n10p37

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aslı Cazorla Milla  
Centro de Estudios Universitarios Madrid, Spain

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Szűcs Róbert Sándor  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 4: Földi Kata  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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:21.02.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 26.02.2024
Manuscript Title: The Opportunity for Profit to College Student-Athletes- Analysis Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0303/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The chosen title is apt for the research topic and its significance. It serves as an effective preview of the content and the direction of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Overall, the abstract efficiently communicates the study's aims however the methods and results are not clearly mentioned.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No grammatical errors or spelling mistakes are found.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The methodology used is presented with clarity, offering a transparent and thorough explanation of the same. Although there are no statistical techniques used, the chosen methodology provides a solid foundation for the research findings.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results of the study are explained clearly and error-free, addressing the potential implications for future.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are clear in a manner where all the research findings are summarized.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Up to date references are used.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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!*

Reviewer Name: Róbert Sándor Szűcs Dr.	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 08.03.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 09.24.2024
Manuscript Title: The Opportunity for Profit to College Student-Athletes- Analysis Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0303/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## 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]
------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title effectively communicates the central theme of the study, which is examining the potential for profit opportunities for college student-athletes. It is concise, clear, and adequately reflects the content discussed throughout the article.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract summarizes the objectives, the scope of the study, and the key findings well. It provides a good overview of the study's focus on the compensation challenges and opportunities for collegiate student-athletes, including future compensation challenges and endorsement opportunities. However, it could be slightly improved by explicitly mentioning the methods used in the study.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Based on the content reviewed, the article appears to be well-written with a few minor errors, which do not significantly detract from the overall readability or professionalism of the paper.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The methodology section details the sources of research data, including peer-reviewed articles, research reports, books, and a survey conducted among student-athletes at Florida A&M University. This provides a clear understanding of how data was collected and analyzed. However, a more detailed explanation of the survey design and statistical analysis could enhance clarity.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The results are clearly presented through figures and a discussion that interprets these findings effectively. The presentation of survey results and the systematic review approach is straightforward and facilitates understanding of the study's findings without apparent errors.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
The conclusions drawn from the study are well-supported by the evidence presented throughout the article. The paper effectively argues for recognizing the value of student-athletes and the potential for their compensation beyond scholarships, reflecting the content discussed in the results and discussion sections.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references listed at the end of the document appear to be comprehensive, covering a wide range of sources that support the study's claims and discussions. This demonstrates thorough research and provides credibility to the study's findings.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

In summary, the paper is well-crafted, presenting a clear and supported argument for the compensation of college student-athletes. The minor suggestions for improvement do not significantly detract from the quality of the work, which is robust in its findings, analysis, and contribution to the field of sport management and student-athlete welfare.

But... please fix it: “However, a more detailed explanation of the survey design and statistical analysis could enhance clarity.”. For example, the reviewer of the article did not find how many people the research sample included.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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!*

Reviewer Name: Kata Földi	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/03/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/04/2024
Manuscript Title: The Opportunity for Profit to College Student-Athletes- Analysis Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0303/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

## 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]
------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract presents objects, secondary methods and results, but I missed more details primary methods.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There isn't grammatical error and spelling mistake in this article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The manuscript secondary research methods are explained clearly The manuscript primary methods are explained mainly clearly. I missed some details from primary research circumstances, for example the method of asking (personal, phone, website), method of sampling, number of respondents and period of time of the questionnaire survey. The hypotheses and the topics of the questionnaire were missed.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>In the literature review second page in this paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>“In 2018, of 2.9 million students, ages 16 to 24, who graduated from high school between January and October 2017, 1.9 million, or more than sixty-six% of them, were enrolled in college in October (bls.gov, 2018). This number is 3% lower than the previous year (2017), with more than 69% of high school graduates enrolling in college.” The correct unit of measure %point after number 3, not %.</i></p> <p><i>I missed the year on the second page from these paragraphs:</i></p> <p><i>According to the NCAA, two percent of high school athletes are awarded athletic scholarships.</i></p> <p><i>According to the NCAA, more than eight million high school students play a sport in the United States. Still, of this number, only sixteen percent (1,280,000) of these athletes will continue to compete on the collegiate level at an NCAA school.</i></p> <p><i>The cross-tabulation analyzes (answers and sociodemographic characteristics) and significance levels are missed from primary research results.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Main statistical results (cross-tabulation analyzes and significance levels) are missed from conclusion.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :



Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

All figures were missed the source. I omitted the number of respondents from naming figures of primary research results, for example: (N = ). Two figures are numbered 6 on page 12.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**