



EVALUATION CRITERIA

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

The main evaluation criteria that need to be considered as a reviewer are the **originality, presentation, relevance, and significance** of the manuscript's subject matter to the readership of the UTM-FC 2018 Proceeding.

Questions to have in mind when reading the manuscript (in no particular order):

1. Is the topic important and relevant for publication?
2. Does the work presented in the manuscript is original?
3. Does the manuscript uses sufficient references?
4. Does the manuscript uses appropriate language and styles?
5. The title of the manuscript is appropriate?
6. The order of presentation is satisfactory?
7. Is the abstract adequately summarizes the content of the manuscript?
8. Is the introduction adequately developed?
9. Is the problem described in the manuscript clearly stated?
10. Does the adopted methodology described in the manuscript is properly conducted and appropriate?
11. Are the findings of this manuscript interpreted correctly?
12. Is the manuscript free from obvious errors?
13. Is the quality of figures and illustrations acceptable for publications?
14. Does the manuscript dwell on any sensitive issues?

SUGGESTIONS TO THE AUTHOR(S)

What can the author(s) do to improve the quality of this paper?

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EDITORS

- **Accept** – if the paper is suitable for publication in its current form.
- **Minor revision** – if the paper will be ready for publication after light revisions. Please list the revisions you would recommend the author makes.

- **Major revision** – if the paper would benefit from substantial changes such as expanded data analysis, widening of the literature review, or rewriting sections of the text.
- **Reject** – if the paper is not suitable for publication with this journal or if the revisions that would need to be undertaken are too fundamental for the submission to continue being considered in its current form.

SAMPLE COMMENTS

Please note that these are just examples of how you might provide feedback on an author's work. Your review should, of course, always be tailored to the paper in question and the specific requirements of the journal and the editor.

■ Positive comments

- *The manuscript is well-written in an engaging and lively style.*
- *Overall, the article is interesting even if it is directed not to a broad audience. Some revisions however are necessary before the paper can be published*
- *Given the complexity involved, the author has produced a number of positive and welcome outcomes including the literature review which offers a useful overview of current research and policy and the resulting bibliography which provides a very useful resource for current practitioners.*

■ When constructive criticism is required

- *Abstract – Please state the advantage(s) of the proposed approach compared to the existing approach. What is the contribution?*
- *Section 3 is titled as Problem Statement but there is no problem highlighted in this section. Need rearrangement and improvement of sections and subsections accordingly based on research methodology mentioned by author(s).*
- *I would strongly advise the author(s) of this paper to rewrite their introduction, analysis, and discussion to produce a more contextualized introduction to...*
- *Conclusion can be improved. Pin point with problems, research methodology and results.*

■ When linguistic alterations are required

- *This paper would benefit from some closer proof reading. It includes numerous linguistic errors (e.g. agreement of verbs) that at times make it difficult to follow. I would suggest that it may be useful to engage a professional English language editor following a restructure of the paper.*
- *The language needs revision, and a native speaker should carefully go over the text and fix the numerous small errors in English. Try to avoid very long sentences.*

A NOTE ABOUT REVISIONS

When authors make revisions to their article in response to reviewer comments, they are asked to submit a list of changes and any comments for transmission to the reviewers. The revised version is usually returned to the original reviewer if possible, who is then asked to affirm whether the revisions have been carried out satisfactorily.