



Referee's Review Form

The type of review adopted by the Journal of the College of Education for Women is Double-Blind Review. All the steps of reviewing are fully electronic. The reviewers have to read the criteria required in this journal before assessing the submitted manuscript. Reviewers have the opportunity to provide comments intended for the author and editor either at the same time or separate the comments for the editor aside. Reviewers need to comment on the paper inside the paper using the add comment button in addition to fill in the review form. Reviewers are further required to comply with the [competing interests and disclosure policy](#).

TITLE

1. Does the title reflect the nature of the study?
2. Are there any suggested changes to the title? What are they? **(The title should be concise and to the point)**

ABSTRACT

1. Does the abstract contain the following pieces of information: **(the nature of the study** (i.e., whether it is qualitative or quantitative), **the type of the study** (i.e., whether it is descriptive, application, experimental, etc.), **the objective(s)**, **the model/theory or concept used in the analysis**, and **the main conclusions that the study has arrived at?** Kindly identify the missing points.
2. Is the total number of words in the Arabic and English abstracts (350)? **(It should not exceed 350 words)**

KEYWORDS

1. Are the suggested keywords suitable? If not- what do you suggest? **(The minimum number of keywords should be 4 whereas the maximum number is 7, and they should be arranged alphabetically)**

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Does the section of the introduction properly pave the way to the main idea of the study, and include the problem, objectives, research questions, and the significance of the study; each in one separate paragraph?

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Does the theoretical background cover the related terms and topics?
2. Are there any references to previously conducted studies and citations from papers published in our journal?
3. Is the theory/ model or concept to be used in the analysis fully explained after the previously conducted studies?

3. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

1. Is the methodology section explained in a proper and scientific way, shedding light on: the limitations of the study, the steps to be followed in the analysis of each of the set objectives, data sampling and collection, ethical considerations-if needed- and other important methodological points?

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

1. Have the data been analyzed in a proper and scientific way, reflecting the theoretical or conceptual framework?

4. CONCLUSIONS

1. Do the conclusions answer the research questions of the study? Are they new?

REFERENCES

1. Are the references documented in a proper way following APA style, version 7?
2. Are the reference enough and new?

3. Are the major number of references belong to the last five years?

GENERALNOTES

1. Is the language of the study proper?

2. Are there any other notes regarding any section of the paper?

The Name of the Reviewer and its Scientific Title:

Place of Work:

Date of Receiving the Paper:

The Reviewer's Decision:

Accepted for Publication with Minor Corrections

Accepted for Publication with Major Corrections

Rejected

Kindly use any of the following tools: (✓, ✗) by coping them and pasting them in the right slot.