

**Paper: “The Relationship between Constructivist Thinking and Academic Engagement among University Students in Light of Some Variables”**

**Submitted: 08 October 2024**

**Accepted: 03 December 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Mohamad Mostfa Egbaria

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p87](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p87)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yelena Zascerinska  
University of Latvia, Latvia

Reviewer 2: Daniel Jambo  
Department of Research and Human Resource Development Ministry of Education,  
Eritrea

### 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: <b>Dr. Jelena Zascerinska</b>	
University/Country: <b>Latvia</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>7 November 2024</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>8 November 2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>The Relationship Between Constructivist Thinking and Academic Engagement Among University Students in Light of Some Variables</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1053/24</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>YES</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>YES</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>YES</b>	

#### 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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The title is well-formulated and gives an impression of the research field.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The abstract includes all the necessary elements.</b>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>No mistakes are found. Grammar is good. Language is rich in vocabulary and easy to follow.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The author(s) explain the methods of data collection and processing.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The results are well-presented.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The conclusions could be extended by research limitations, future work directions, etc. It would be great to include implications for teachers.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The references are a little bit outdated. The latest reference refers to 2020. Page 8: Schreiber and Rowe (2016) as well as Finn (1993) are cited in text but not included in the list of references.</b>	
<b>Page 11: Morsi et al (2020) is cited in text but not included in the list of references.</b>	
<b>Several references are shown in the list of references but not cited in the text, e.g. Epstein (1998a); Finn&amp;Voelkl (1993); etc</b>	

**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):**

**Thanks to the author(s) for the interesting contribution.**

**The topic is highly relevant.**

**The contribution is well-structured and well-written.**

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

No extra comments

### 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: Dr. Daniel Jambo Ghirmai	
University/Country: Eritrea	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/11/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/11/2024
Manuscript Title: The Relationship Between Constructivist Thinking and Academic Engagement Among University Students in Light of Some Variable	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 53.10.2024	
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>
<i>The title is so clear and adequate to the contents of the study</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract needs some editing. The researcher required to state the study research design and tool of data analysis. Besides, the researcher should state those who stand to benefit from this study and the conclusion. Edit and replace the word participation by ‘engagement’ on the keywords.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There are very few spelling mistakes and spacing errors</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>This part of the study needs some work. The researcher does not clearly state the reason for using availability sampling of the college for the study. There is lack of clarity on the context of the study and the relationship between the tool used and the theoretical framework.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors, but they need some modification in table one. Moreover, the researcher should include some demographic information of participants like gender, age, year of study and so on in the result section.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Discussion as a part of the study did not presented. Therefore, the researcher should include as a part or should add necessary literatures in result part to support the findings of the study.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The references are not comprehensive and out of 25 references only three references are new and most of them are old references more than 10 years old. The researcher needs to replace or support the arguments grounded on these old references using more recent literature. This will show knowledge is not static.</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):**

Already I gave my review suggestions in the manuscript

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