econsciences.com 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-Go	od	3-Fair	2-Bad	1-V	ery bad	Í		
				5	4	3	2	1
Is the article proper f								
Are the spelling rules								
Is the used language scientific?								
Is there any doubt ab								
Are the title and contents in a harmony?								
Is the abstract sufficient?								
Is the classification s	ufficien	t?						
Is the article an origin	al stud	y?						
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 m	ethodo	logy?						
Are the data set and sources of data reliable?								
Are the evidences clear and sufficient about the hypothesis?								
Are the results suffic	ent?							
Is the literature search sufficient?								
Is there SSCI citation about 30 per cent?								
Is it sufficient for the	level o	f TER Publishi	ng?					

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
1		
There are new points that have to be corrected	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If you decided to the article "can not be published" or "has new points that have to be corrected", please write your reasons.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my first report and the points that I suggested for correction, with my second report I decided to the article CAN NOT BE PUBLISHED/CAN BE PUBLISHED AFTER NEW CORRECTIONS.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:

econsciences.com



paraf

econsciences.com