

# JURNAL INSTUN

## REVIEW FORM

<b>Title</b>	
--------------	--

<b>Section 1: Reviewers Information</b>	
<b>Reviewer's Name</b>	
<b>Institutional Affiliation</b>	
<b>Specialisation</b>	
<b>Date received by reviewer</b>	
<b>Date submitted by reviewer</b>	

<b>Section 2: Rating</b>						
1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=very good; 5=excellent [Select by placing X in the relevant column]						
No	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
1	<b>Title:</b> Suitability to the contents.					
2	<b>Abstract:</b> Concise and in line with the required structure.					
3	<b>Introduction:</b> Sufficient background information.					
4	<b>Literature Review:</b> Adequate understanding and reputable background sources cited.					
5	<b>Methodology:</b> Accurate and appropriate.					
6	<b>Results/findings:</b> Supported by data analysis.					
7	<b>Discussion:</b> Data analysis logically presented.					
8	<b>Conclusion:</b> Specific and correct.					
9	<b>References:</b> Comply the format.					
10	<b>Originality:</b> Containing new and significant information adequate to justify publication					

11	<b>Quality of communication:</b> Clarity in expressing the case; clarity of language and readability					
12	<b>Overall Rating</b>					

**Section 3: Specific Comments by the Reviewer (for the author)**

- The reviewer are required to identify and comment on strengths and weaknesses of the writing in terms of each of the format and provide the author with useful suggestions for improvement of the writing.
- The review should also specifically indicate point by point any corrections or revisions to be made by the author in order for the writing to be accepted for publication.
- This section will be given to the author with your name removed.

**Strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript**

Title:

Abstract:

Introduction:

Literature Review:

Methodology:

Results/findings:

Discussion:

Conclusion:

References:

Originality:

Quality of communication:

**Specific Comments for corrections/revisions**

**Section 4: Reviewer's comments on ethical concerns** (for the editor)

The reviewer should comment on any ethical concerns raised by the writing, or any possible evidence of low standard of scientific conduct.

[This information will NOT be revealed to the author.]

**Section 5: Recommendation**

Select only one of the following by placing (X).

<b>Options</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<b>Accept as it is</b> (With only minor changes to be made by editorial staff)	
<b>Accept with minor revisions</b> (with only minor changes to be made by the author)	
<b>Return to author for major revisions</b> (author to revise and resubmit for another rounds of reviews)	
<b>Reject</b>	

**Accept as it is:** The writing warrants publication as a peer-reviewed article. It is a good contribution and is well conceived and executed.

**Accept with minor revisions:** The writing should be accepted after minor revisions as noted in the comments. (Reviewer's comments should be sufficiently specific and detailed for the author to address issues of concern.)

**Return to author for major revisions:** The writing does not warrant publication in its current form, but it will warrant publication as a peer-reviewed article with suggested revisions.

**Reject:** The writing does not warrant publication as a peer-reviewed article.

**Section 6: Signature of Reviewer**

.....  
(NAME)  
(DESIGNATION)