ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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: 1/19/2017Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 1/20/2017

Manuscript Title: The Impact of using Understanding by Design (UbD) model on 8th grade student's achievement in science

ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 01120/17

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(a brief explanation is recommendable) The Impact of Using Understanding By Design (UbD) Model on 8 th Gra Achievement in Science – A Pilot	nde Student's
Recommend adding something that clearing indicates that this study was ve first time the method was used.	ry small and perhaps the
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
(a brief explanation is recommendable)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
(a brief explanation is recommendable) It is clear that the author's first language is not English. Grammar and mea	aning of some terms

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(a brief explanation is recommendable)	
They are clearly explained, but I question some of the validity. The author i was based on academic achievement test in the sciences material for the 8 th research;" Why would the researcher use a self-prepared assessment? Is twritten? Or, if true this sounds like a conflict of interest. Perhaps a pre-exist would be more appropriate.	grade prepared by the his segment improperly
Sample appears to be one of convenience and if so, it was not stated. Not cl the control. Was it 50% of each gender group? If so, that meant that only 15 gender were in each – control and experiment. Very small sample size.	
Suggest that the authors recognize the study as being a pilot – or some such small group size.	phrase that denotes the
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
(a brief explanation is recommendable)	
The major revision here is grammar and sometimes the meaning of phrases reviewed for English speaking appropriateness.	, or words should be
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
(a brief explanation is recommendable)	d by the author is not
(a brief explanation is recommendable) This study's sample size is very small. Therefore, the generalizability offere appropriate. This section should be revised. Maybe it 'builds upon the curre another example'	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:





