

Reviewers Guide

SECTION I

Reviewer's Name:	
E-Mail:	
Manuscript Number:	
Title:	
Date received by the Reviewer:	
Date Returned by the Reviewer:	

SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	
Introduction:	
Methodology:	
Results:	
Discussion:	

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:	
Others:	
Decision:	

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	
Contribution To The Field:	
Technical Quality:	
Clarity Of Presentation :	
Depth Of Research:	

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	

SECTION V: Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):

Questions to guide the reviewer in assessment of the paper:

Please provide examples and evidence for your responses, do not simply answer yes or no.

1. **Topic and content:**

- 1.1. Is the topic relevant for the journal?
- 1.2. Is the content important to the field?
- 1.3. Is the work original? (If not, please give references)

2. **Title:** Does the title reflect the contents of the article?

3. **Abstract:** To what extent does the abstract reflect aspects of the study: background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions?

4. **Introduction / Background:** Is the study rationale adequately described?

5. **Objectives:** Are the study objectives clearly stated and defined?

6. **Methodology:**

- 6.1. To what extent is the study design appropriate and adequate for the objectives?
- 6.2. Is the sample size appropriate and adequately justified?
- 6.3. Is the sampling technique appropriate and adequately described?
- 6.4. How well are the methods and instruments of data collection described?
- 6.5. How well are techniques to minimize bias/errors documented?

7. **Ethical Consideration:** If there are issues related to ethics, are they adequately described? (For human studies, has ethical approval been obtained?)

8. **Analysis and results:**

- 8.1. Are the methods adequately described?
- 8.2. Are the methods of data analysis appropriate?
- 8.3. Do the results answer the research question?
- 8.4. Are the results credible?
- 8.5. Is statistical significance well documented (e.g. as confidence intervals or P-value)?
- 8.6. Are the findings presented logically with appropriate displays and explanations?

9. **Discussion:**

- 9.1. How well are the key findings stated?
- 9.2. To what extent have differences or similarities with other studies been discussed and reasons for these given
- 9.3. Are the findings discussed in the light of previous evidence?
- 9.4. Are the implications of these findings clearly explained?
- 9.5. Is the interpretation warranted by and sufficiently derived from and focused on the data and results?

10. **Conclusion(s):** Do the results justify the conclusion(s)?

11. **References:**

- 11.1. Are the references appropriate and relevant?
- 11.2. Are they up to date?
- 11.3. Are there any obvious, important references that should have been included and have not been?
- 11.4. Do the references follow the recommended style?
- 11.5. Are there any errors?

12. Writing:

- 12.1. Is the paper clearly written?
- 12.2. Is the paper presented logically (e.g. correct information in each section, logical flow of arguments)?

Duties of Reviewers

Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and through the editorial communications with the author may also assist the author in improving the paper.

Promptness

Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Reviewers are expected to give decision based on the checklist prepared to support reviewers response.

Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors,

companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Reviewer Misconduct

AJSI Editors will take reviewer misconduct seriously and pursue any allegation of breach of confidentiality, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Allegations of serious reviewer misconduct, such as plagiarism, will be taken to the institutional level.