

Paper: “The Impact of Career Guidance Service Quality at the German Agency for International Cooperation on Service Recipients' Satisfaction: The Role of Career Counselors as Mediating Factors, in Jordan”

Submitted: 28 September 2024

Accepted: 21 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Amer Abdelqader Harazneh

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n32p48](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n32p48)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Vasilika Kume
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Mary Hollingsworth
University of West Alabama, USA

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: VASILIKA KUME	
University/Country: Tirana Business University College, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/10/24	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/10/24
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Career Guidance Service Quality at the German Agency for International Cooperation on Service Recipients' Satisfaction: The Role of Career Counselors as Mediating Factors, in Jordan	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title matches the content, but in my opinion it is too long.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Yes, the abstract presents objectives, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

<i>Quantitative method is used in the article. The methodology and way of data processing is clearly explained. the author has clearly explained the Model of the study.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and explained in narrative and graphics.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are clear</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References are clear, and match the content of the article</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Mary Ann Hollingsworth	
University/Country: Liberty University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 10.22.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/31.2024
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Career Guidance Service Quality at the German Agency for International Cooperation on Service Recipients' Satisfaction: The Role of Career Counselors as Mediating Factors, in Jordan	
ESJ Manuscript Number:07.31,10,24	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title does show good summary statement of the content of the manuscript.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract does address study objectives, methodology, and results. Some more quantitative information would have been helpful such as number of study participants. se insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Grammatical errors are present such as capitalization at the beginning of a sentence. Some APA corrections are needed such as the abstract as one paragraph and use of the same font throughout.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>There is considerable description of the study methods. The explanation would be stronger if correlation with the six objectives from page six were integrated – for example what of the methodology addressed objective 1, 2, etc?</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results would be more clear to frame the discussion of results as related to each of the six objectives and four hypotheses.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The concluding information does fit with the content. Notes in numbers four and five above apply here – if those were addressed, the conclusions would be strengthened.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references seem to strongly support the study.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is good presentation of background, conduct of the study, and follow-up recommendations. See notes 4 and 5 about sharing some information on methodology and results within the framework of the six objectives and four hypotheses. This could be provided with use of subheadings or tables to show the connections.