

# Coaching Clinics of Journal Manuscript

## Peer reviewed evaluation

- In this stage, without disclosing his identity, Reviewer is to give objective evaluation on every assessment criterion set for the journal.
- Answering all the assessment questions in the form of multiple choice is mandatory. Your answer for this section will not be delivered to the authors. While answering assessment questions in the form of text box is advisory, your evaluation will be delivered to the author/s via email by the Secretariat.
- As the final stage, Reviewer is to recommend one of the following decisions:
  - [1] Accept Submission : manuscript is unconditionally accepted
  - [2] Revisions Required : revision is needed, while rereview is not
  - [3] Resubmit for Review : revision is obligatory to be resubmitted for rereview process
  - [4] Resubmit Elsewhere : manuscript is rejected and you suggest that the manuscript is sent to another reviewer
  - [5] Decline Submission : manuscript is rejected
  - [6] See Comments : revision is needed as suggested by reviewer (similar to recommendation )

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Please tick (V) for choosing question in a table

### 1. Title of the manuscript;

Does it well represent the essence of the paper? Is it specific? Is it effective? \*

Yes	No

Suggestion/revision for author/s regarding TITLE

### 2. Abstract and keywords;

Do they well represent the essence of the the manuscript? \*

Yes	No

Suggestion/revision for author/s regarding ABSTRACT and KEYWORDS

--

**3. Problem statement and research purpose;**

Are they well defined? \*

Good	Moderate	Bad

**4. Chapter title writing;**

Chapter title should be written carefully to avoid any further sub chapter. Sometimes sub chapter is made in an effort to provide detail information regarding literature review, problem statement, aims of the study, and so on such as those available in books or thesis. This endeavour is unacceptable. \*

Consistent	Inconsistent

Suggestion/revision for author/s regarding INTRODUCTION

--

**5. The manuscript is: \***

A primary/ secondary research	A review/thought	A short communication

**6. Idea originality;**

Does the manuscript offer original idea based on the novelty and the science/technology's state of the art it contains? \*

Very high	High	Fair	Low	Very low
-----------	------	------	-----	----------

--	--	--	--	--

**7. Research Methodology;**

Is the methodology in line with literature review and analysis conducted for the manuscript? Is the methodology applied in accordance with problem statement and the research purpose? \*

Good	Moderate	Bad

Suggestion/revision for author/s regarding CONTENT

**8. Scientific impact of the manuscript;**

Does the manuscript provide benefit or any significance to the development of Science and Technology? \*

Very high	High	Fair	Low	Very low

**9. Comprehensiveness of method, discussion, and analysis and synthesis;**

Is the paper written meticulously and provide thorough solution to formulated problems? \*

Very profound and thorough	Profound and thorough	Fairly profound and thorough	Less profound and thorough	Not profound and thorough

Suggestion/revision for authors regarding RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**10. Conclusion;**

Does the conclusion offer significant, profound and thorough solutions? \*

Good	Moderate	Bad

Suggestion/revision for authors regarding CONCLUSION

--

**11. List of reference writing;**

Does it comply with available writing guide? \*

Standard	Un-standard

**12. Comparison between primary references and other references;**

Primary references incorporates scientific magazine, journal paper, proceeding, dissertation, or thesis. \*

Good(>80% is of primary references)	Fair (40% - 80% is of primary references)	Bad (<40% is of primary references)

**13. References up-to-date-ness;**

Are the references up to date? Up to date means the references are of five recent years. \*

Up to date (>80% is of five recent years)	Fairly up to date (40% - 80% is of five recent years)	Less up to date (<40% is of recent years)

Suggestion/revision for author/s regarding REFERENCES

--

**14. The presentation of supporting instruments;**

Are the figure/s and table/s well presented? Do the figure/s and table/s provide supporting information for the manuscript? \*

Informative and complementary	Uninformative and uncomplementary

OTHER Additional suggestion/revision for author/s

--

**15. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process**

Rejected	Revisions Required	Accepted