

## **Reviewer's Responsibilities**

- By reviewing unpublished submissions, reviewers are accepting the ethical responsibility not to disclose their contents.
- Reviewers should objectively judge the quality of the manuscript and show appropriate respect for the authors.
- Reviewers should have no conflicts of interests with the article, authors, or funding institutions.
- Reviewers should point out relevant references that have not been cited.
- Reviewers should treat all submissions in confidence.

## **Review Form**

### **I. Presentation**

1. Does the paper title reflect the content of the paper?
2. Is the abstract concise and informative?
3. Do the figures and tables aid the clarity of the paper?
4. Are the English and syntax of the paper satisfactory?

### **II. Methodology**

1. Is this paper an original work?
2. Is this paper logically organized?
3. Does this paper clearly state research questions?
4. Does this paper clearly indicate theoretical development?
5. Are the methods used in the paper appropriate and adequately described?

### **III. Conclusions**

1. Are the conclusions of this study consistent with the results of the analysis/arguments?
2. Are the research questions answered in the paper?
3. Are all conclusions proven in the paper?
4. Are the theoretical and practical implications of the results adequately discussed?
5. Are the research limitations noted? Are the references sufficient and representative?

### **IV. What is your overall assessment of the contribution of this study (5 being highest and 1 being lowest)?**

- 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1

### **V. Recommendations:**

- Accept as stands

- Accept with minor revision
- Accept with major revision
- Decline with resubmission invited
- Decline with no encouragement to resubmit

If accepted, the paper should be published under the following heading:

- Article
- Technical Note (within 3000 words)

**Referee's Comments (To be sent to author(s)):**

**Confidential Comments to the Editor:**