**Review Form**

            The general purpose of your review is to assist the editors in evaluating the worthiness of this manuscript for publication, and to help the author(s) make improvements to the manuscript. Please consider in your comments the aspects from the table. If your evaluations in some point(s) are negative, please give clear arguments.

            If you consider, you can directly make some corrections within the manuscript (using Track Changes), or make suggestions using reviewing/comments.

**Journal Review Form** (it can be copy/paste on Word file, and after evaluation and completion the file can be uploaded by reviewer using the review system; if Track Changes was used directly on manuscript for corrections, comments and recommendations, the file can be also upload by the reviewer alongside with Journal Review Form)

|  |
| --- |
| **Journal Review Form**  ***Instructions***: The journal is committed to high academic standards, treating publication as a collaborative process between **Author**, **Reviewers**and **Editors**. The goal of the peer review process is to improve the academic and scientific quality of the submissions. |
| Manuscript Number (ID) |
| Manuscript Title |
| Journal Name [not necessary] |
| Reviewer [not necessary] |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overview (Please rate each item by typing letter ‘x’ in the appropriate box)** | | | | | | |
| Nr | Criteria | Poor | Below average | Average | Good | Very good |
| 1 | Does the title of the paper clearly reflect its contents? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Is the abstract sufficiently informative, covering all sections, eg. purpose, technical approach, results, and conclusion/recommendation? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Does the introduction state the scientific problem clearly? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Is the description of materials and methods sufficiently informative to allow replication of the experiment? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Are the statistical methods used correctly and adequately? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Are the experimental results consistent scientifically and/or practically? Are they sufficient to justify the conclusions? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Are the results properly presented and the manuscript is adequately discussed (concise and tightly argued)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Does the paper make a significant new contribution to the advancement of knowledge or towards a better understanding of existing concepts? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Is the content of the manuscript acceptable and article structured in agreement with instructions to authors? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Do the tables and figures contain relevant results and information? Are they adequately described (units, definitions, abbreviations) and self-explanatory? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Are the references adequate and properly chosen? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Does the English language require improvement? | Yes/No | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GENERAL COMMENTS**  **Subject**  The topic of the paper: is relevant, timely, and of interest to the audience of the journal?  Reviewer comment:  **Originality**  Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Does the article adhere to the journal’s standards? Is the research question an important one?  Reviewer comment:  **Structure**  Is the article clearly laid out? Are all the key elements (where relevant) present: abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions? Consider each element in turn:  **-Title**: Does it clearly describe the article?  Reviewer comment:  **-Abstract**: Does it reflect the content of the article?  Reviewer comment:  **-Introduction**: Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated? Normally, the introduction should summarize relevant research to provide context, and explain what other authors’ findings, if any, are being challenged or extended. Describe it the experiment, the hypothesis(es) and the general experimental design or method?  Reviewer comment:  **-Method:**Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in a meaningful way? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the equipment and materials, experimental techniques (statistical methods) been adequately and correctly described? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?  Reviewer comment:  **-Results:**Does the author(s) explain clearly laid out and in a logical sequence what he/she/they discovered in the research? You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted. Are the statistics correct? If the ‘Discussion’ is in a separate section, interpretation of results should not be included here.  Reviewer comment:  **-Discussion/ Conclusions / Recommendations:**Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and to earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward? It seems reasonable if in discussion or conclusion the author(s) indicate how the results relate to expectations, if the article support or contradict previous theories, the contribution to scientific knowledge, eventually recommendations.  Reviewer comment:    **Language**  If an article is poorly written due to grammatical errors, while it may make it more difficult to understand the science, you do not need to correct the English. You should bring this to the attention of the editor, however.  Reviewer comment:  **Finally**, on balance, when considering the whole article, do the figures and tables inform the reader, are they an important part of the story? Do the figures describe the data accurately? Are they consistent, e.g. bars in charts are the same width, the scales on the axis are logical?  Reviewer comment:  **Previous Research**  If the article builds upon previous research, does it reference that work appropriately? Are there any important works that have been omitted? Are the references accurate?  Reviewer comment:  **Ethical Issues**   * Plagiarism: If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible. * Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor. * Other ethical concerns: For medical research, has confidentiality been maintained? Has there been a violation of the accepted norms in the ethical treatment of animal or human subjects? If so, then these should also be identified to the editor.   Reviewer comment: | |
|  | |
| **Strengths of manuscript** | |
| Reviewer comment: | |
| **Weakness of manuscript** | |
| Reviewer comment: | |
| **Suggestions for improvement** | |
| Reviewer comment: | |
| **Recommended disposition of the manuscript: check one**  **(type letter ‘x’ in the appropriate box)** | |
| Accept |  |
| Accept with minor revisions |  |
| Accept with major revisions |  |
| Invite re-submission for a new review after major revisions |  |
| Reject |  |