

Review Form: Research Articles

Manuscript Title:

Reviewer Name:

Instructions: Please provide a comprehensive and constructive evaluation of the manuscript based on the criteria below. Your detailed feedback will assist the editor in making an informed decision and will help the authors improve their work. Please use the rating scale and provide specific comments in the spaces provided.

Reviewers should note the following:

- **Expected Article Structure:** Research articles should follow the structure: 1) Introduction, 2) Literature Review, 3) Methodology, 4) Research Findings, and 5) Conclusion and Discussion.
- **Minimum Requirements:** Articles should be at least 5,000 words in length (including all elements) and should include a minimum of 15 references.

❖ Evaluation Criteria (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1 [Poor] - 5 [Excellent])	
Criteria	Grade
1) Originality and Significance [Is the research novel and original? Does it address an important research question? What is the potential impact of this work?]	
2) Literature Review [Is the literature review comprehensive and up-to-date? Does it provide a strong foundation for the research?]	
3) Theoretical Framework [Is the theoretical framework clearly articulated and appropriate for the research question?]	
4) Methodology [Is the research design appropriate? Are the methods sound and well-executed? Are there any concerns about the validity of the findings?]	
5) Data and Analysis [Is the data sufficient and appropriate? Is the data analysis rigorous and accurate?]	
6) Results and Interpretation [Are the results clearly presented and logically interpreted? Are the conclusions supported by the evidence?]	
7) Clarity and Organization [Is the manuscript well-written, clear, and logically organized? Is the language appropriate for the target audience?]	
8) Sustainability Relevance [Does the research address issues related to sustainability or sustainable development? Does it contribute to a more sustainable future? In what ways does the research contribute or fall short in advancing sustainability?]	
9) National Knowledge & International Connections [How relevant are the findings to the national knowledge base of Thailand? Does it connect to or build upon existing research and understanding at a national level? How does this research contribute to a broader understanding of issues or trends within Thailand? How does this research relate to, build upon, or contrast with international research and knowledge in this field?]	

❖ Specific Comments to Author(s):
1) Strengths of the Manuscript: (Provide specific examples; Minimum 50 words)

2) Weaknesses of the Manuscript: (Provide specific examples; Minimum 50 words)
3) Suggestions for Improvement: (Provide detailed and actionable recommendations for the authors; Minimum 100 words)

❖ Confidential Comments to the Editor (Optional): (These comments will not be shared with the authors)

❖ Recommendation to Editor (Please mark “x” for appropriate option)
☐ Excellent, accept the submission (5) ☐ Good, accept the submission with minor revisions required (4) ☐ Acceptable, major revisions required (3) ☐ Reject with resubmission encouraged (2) ☐ Reject with no resubmission (1)

Please return the form to the editor-in-chief.

Review Form: Review Articles

Manuscript Title:

Reviewer Name:

Instructions: Please provide a comprehensive and constructive evaluation of the manuscript based on the criteria below. Your detailed feedback will assist the editor in making an informed decision and will help the authors improve their work. Please use the rating scale and provide specific comments in the spaces provided.

Reviewers should note the following:

- **Expected Article Structure:** Review articles should generally follow the structure: 1) Introduction, 2) Main Content (body), and 3) Conclusion.
- **Minimum Requirements:** Articles should be at least 5,000 words in length (including all elements) and should include a minimum of 15 references.

❖ Evaluation Criteria (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1 [Poor] - 5 [Excellent])	
Criteria	Grade
1) Scope and Focus [Is the scope of the review clearly defined and appropriate? Does the review have a clear and focused purpose?]	
2) Comprehensiveness [Does the review cover the relevant literature adequately? Are there any significant omissions?]	
3) Critical Analysis and Synthesis [Does the review provide a critical analysis of the literature? Does it synthesize information from different sources effectively?]	
4) Structure and Organization [Is the review well-structured and logically organized? Is the argument clear and persuasive?]	
5) Clarity and Readability [Is the review well-written and easy to understand? Is the language appropriate for the target audience?]	
6) Contribution to the Field [Does the review offer new insights or perspectives on the topic? Does it identify directions for future research?]	
7) Sustainability Relevance [Does the review address issues related to sustainability or sustainable development? Does it contribute to a better understanding of sustainable solutions? What are the key sustainability takeaways from the review?]	
8) National Knowledge & International Connections [Does the review adequately address the national context of Thailand, connecting the discussion to the broader knowledge base of Thailand? Does it integrate or compare findings from Thai studies or literature at a national level? How does the review contribute to a more comprehensive picture of Thailand, and how does it relate to relevant international findings?]	

❖ Specific Comments to Author(s):
1) Strengths of the Manuscript: (Provide specific examples; Minimum 50 words)
2) Weaknesses of the Manuscript: (Provide specific examples; Minimum 50 words)
3) Suggestions for Improvement: (Provide detailed and actionable recommendations for the authors; Minimum 100 words)

--

❖ Confidential Comments to the Editor (Optional): (These comments will not be shared with the authors)

--

❖ Recommendation to Editor (Please mark “x” for appropriate option)
--

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">☐ Excellent, accept the submission (5)☐ Good, accept the submission with minor revisions required (4)☐ Acceptable, major revisions required (3)☐ Reject with resubmission encouraged (2)☐ Reject with no resubmission (1) |
|---|

Please return the form to the editor-in-chief.