Peer Reviewer Final Report

Article number	
Title of the article	
Arriving date to Peer Reviewer	
Date of report	

Dear peer reviewer, Please mark below questions by using quinary Likert system.

5-Very good   4-Good   3-Fair   2-Bad   1-Very bad

	5	4	3	2	1
Is the article proper for the publishing realm of JEPE?					
Are the spelling rules properly fulfilled?					
Is the used language scientific?					
Is there any doubt about plagiarism at any level?					
Are the title and contents in a harmony?					
Is the abstract sufficient?					
Is the classification sufficient?					
Is the article an original study?					
Does the article make any contribution to the science?					
Does the article make any contribution to the related field?					
Has the hypothesis been stated clearly?					
Has the theoretical frame of the subject been stated?					
Is there a scientific methodology?					
Are the data set and sources of data reliable?					
Are the evidences clear and sufficient about the hypothesis?					
Are the results sufficient?					
Is the literature search sufficient?					
Is there SSCI citation about 30 per cent?					
Is it sufficient for the level of JEPE Publishing?					

Dear Peer Reviewer, please write your final decision about the article in which your first decion was 'It has to be corrected' about. (Your final decision must be based on your suggestions that you wrote in your first report.)

It has been corrected. It can be published.	paraph

There are new points that have to be corrected.	paraph

It cannot be published.	paraph

If you decided to the article "can not be published" or "has new points that have to be corrected", please write your reasons.

After my first report and the points that I suggested for correction, with my second report I decided to the article CAN NOT BE PUBLISHED/CAN BE PUBLISHED AFTER NEW CORRECTIONS. Because:

paraf