

Guidelines for Reviewing

You will be given an evaluation sheet. As you examine the manuscript to fill in the evaluation form, there are a number of issues you should consider:

What do the researchers want to find out? **(objectives)**

1. Why is that important to investigate or understand? **(significance)**
2. How are the researchers investigating this? Are their research methods appropriate and adequate to the task? **(Proper Methodology)**
3. What do they claim to have found out and are the findings clearly stated? **(Results)**
4. How does this advance knowledge in the field? **(Achievement)**
5. How well do the researchers place their findings within the context of ongoing scholarly inquiry about this topic?

The organization of the article.

The good organization of the paper will allow you to find answers to the above questions quickly and easily. The logical organization is the way to find that the paper enjoy a high level of consistency from the opening paragraphs to the conclusion?

Check if	<p>The problem being studied is significant.</p> <p>The title reflects the content of the paper.</p> <p>The abstract is short and informative enough to stand on its own</p> <p>Enough precise keywords are provided</p>
-----------------	--

The introduction should have all research questions specifically stated. It should illustrate what the authors want to find out. The introduction also should include Evidences on the significance of the paper.

Following there should be **a review of the existing research literature on this specific topic**. The authors should :

- Present a convincing line of argument here and a proof that they are just name-dropping (citing sources that may be important, without a clear underlying logic for how they may be important)
- Focus on ideas, or merely on discrete facts or findings.
- Give sufficient attention to the prior explanations for the questions they are investigating.
- Clear statement of research questions or hypotheses.

Check if	<p>The introduction of the paper describes the problem within a theoretical framework.</p> <p>The background reveals a relationship to the problem.</p> <p>Enough literature is provided in the background.</p> <p>The sources cited are original, reliable, important, and recent.</p> <p>The paper includes clearly stated research question</p>
-----------------	--

The **methods and procedures section** is where novice reviewers often start (unwisely) to sharpen their knives. The selection of methods by which the researchers collect data always involve compromises, and there are few studies

that cannot be criticized for errors of commission or omission in terms of textbook criteria for research design and data collection procedures. You could focus on four points here:

1. clear description of research strategies.
2. presentation of sufficient detail about:
 - the sample from which they have collected data;
 - the workability of measures they have attempted to employ;
 - the adequacy of these measures in terms of external and internal validity.
 - the measures should be clearly matched to the research questions or the hypotheses.
3. The availability of choices of methods adequate to find out what they want to find out. This includes other methods that may provide a substantial improvement.
4. provision of justification for the methods they have chosen.

Check if Appropriate research design/method has been used.

The **section presenting research results** is surely the heart of the article--though not its soul (which the reader should find in the opening paragraphs and in the discussion section).

Reviewers might consider four questions here:

1. the results section should take the reader from the research questions to their answers in the data with a clear logic.
2. tables and figures should be clear and succinct and easily readable for major findings by themselves, and there should not be any additional information required. Tables should be consistent with the format of currently accepted by IDJ regarding data presentation.
3. There should not be too many tables or figures in the form of undigested findings.
4. The results presented both statistically and substantively meaningful? Have the authors stayed within the bounds of the results their data will support?

Check if Results have been reported and are applicable and of interest to the field.
Appropriate, correct and rigorous analysis of the research question and/or subject matter is provided.
Accurate and useful interpretation has been made.

The **discussion section** is where the authors can give flight to their findings, so that they soar into the heights of cumulative knowledge development about this topic--or crash into the depths of their CV's, with few other scholars ever citing their findings. Of course few research reports will ever be cited as cornerstones to the development of knowledge about any topic; but your review should encourage authors to aspire to these heights. Consider the following as you evaluate their discussion section:

1. Do the authors present here a concise and accurate summary of their major findings? Does their interpretation fairly represent the data as presented earlier in the article?
2. Do they attempt to integrate these findings in the context of a broader scholarly debate about these issues? Specifically: Do they integrate their findings with the research literature they presented earlier in their article--do they bring the findings back to the previous literature reviewed?

3. Have they gone beyond presenting facts--data--and made an effort to present explanations--understanding? Have they responded to the conceptual or theoretical problems that were raised in the introduction? This is how theory is developed.
4. Do the authors thoughtfully address the limitations of their study?

Check if Sound argument and discussion has been provided.
The study has been evaluated and compared to similar studies (if any).
Logical conclusions from the data have been drawn.
Conclusion describes implications for theory, research, and/or practice.

The **writing style** is important. Consider the three guidelines for successful communication--to be clear, concise, and correct---and whether the authors have achieved it:

1. Is the writing clear? Do the authors communicate their ideas using direct, straightforward, and unambiguous words and phrases? Have they avoided jargon (statistical or conceptual) that would interfere with the communication of their procedures or ideas?
2. Is the writing concise? Are too many words or paragraphs or sections used to present what could be communicated more simply?
3. Is the writing correct? Too many promising scientists have only a rudimentary grasp of grammar and punctuation that result in meandering commas, clauses in complex sentences that are struggling to find their verbs, and adjectives or even nouns that remain quite ambiguous about their antecedents in the sentence. These are not merely technical issues of grammar to be somehow dealt with by a copy-editor down the line. Rather they involve the successful communication of a set of ideas to an audience; and this is the basis of scholarship today.

Check if Style sheet of the IDJ journal have been observed.
Table/figure captions are correct (if applicable).
The reference list follows any of APA, MLA, Turabian, or Chicago Citation Styles..

Your evaluation to the editor:

Make a decision; state it clearly (in your confidential comments at the end of the evaluation form. Ask yourself :

Does the paper fulfill all requirements for a successful paper:

In final comment check:

Acceptable unconditionally

or does it show sufficient promise for revision, in ways that you have clearly demonstrated in your review, to encourage the authors to invest time in revision for this journal?

In final comment check:

Acceptable with minor modifications

or you do feel that the paper should be checked again for satisfactory amendment.

In final comment check:

Acceptable with major modifications

Should this paper be rejected for this journal?

In final comment check:

Not Acceptable for the reasons above

In the last decision reasons for rejection are essential.

Remember that only a few of the articles submitted to a journal will result in

publication. Rates vary from 5% to 25% of initial submissions (for **JMF** it has averaged 15% over the past few years).

Some reasons to reject a manuscript: (a) The research questions have already been addressed in prior studies; (b) the data have been collected in such a way as to preclude useful investigation; (c) the manuscript is not ready for publication-incomplete, improper format, or error-ridden.

Most rejected articles do find a home in other journals. Don't tease authors with hopes for publication in this **Journal** if you feel it is not likely.

Good Reviews and Bad Reviews

A good review is supportive, constructive, thoughtful, and fair

It identifies both strengths and weaknesses, and offers concrete suggestions for improvements. It acknowledges the reviewer's biases where appropriate, and justifies the reviewer's conclusions.

A bad review is superficial, nasty, petty, self-serving, or arrogant.

It indulges the reviewer's biases with no justification. It focuses exclusively on weaknesses and offers no specific suggestions for improvement.