

REVIEW FORM

Article Title:
Reviewer's Name: (The reviewers' identities remain anonymous to author/s)

PART II

Evaluation (Please assign the score for each item below)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor n/a=Not Applicable	
Items	Grade
Overall evaluation on the paper	
1. Contribution to existing knowledge	
2. Novel ideas/concepts/techniques	
3. Complete and accurate figures and tables	
4. Appropriate formating and structure	
5. Readability	
6. Correct analysis	
7. Soundness of methodology	
8. Evidence supports conclusion	
9. Adequacy of literature review	
10. Clear, concise and interesting writing	
❖ Summary	
❖ Strengths	
❖ Weaknesses	
❖ Suggestions to Author/s	

PART III

Recommend the appropriate section for this paper(Please mark "X" for appropriate option)

☐ Original Article

☐ Review Article

☐ Case Report

☐ Short Communication

PART IV

Recommendation to Editor (Please mark "X" for appropriate option)

☐ Excellent, accept the submission (5)

☐ Good, accept the submission with minor revisions required (4)

☐ Acceptable, revisions required (3)

☐ Resubmit for review, major revisions required (2)

☐ Decline the submission (1)

Appendix

Ethical Guidelines for Reviewers

- Respect confidentiality.
- Respect copyright protection of submissions by not using in their own research or work any unpublished data, information, interpretation, or discussion from a submitted article.
- Maintain objectivity in reviewing submissions and avoid personal criticism of authors.
- Be aware of potential conflicts of interest (financial, institutional, collaborative, or other relationships between the reviewer and author) and be willing to alert the editor to these, even if it means withdrawing themselves from reviewing a manuscript.
- Be vigilant for plagiarized material and/or falsified and/or manipulated data and be willing to alert the editor if this is suspected in a manuscript.