

JUSIFO Manuscript Template

Version 5, *last updated*: September 2026

Before you complete this template, please read the following important information carefully.

- This template is intended for manuscripts submitted to JUSIFO. Authors **should use this template** when preparing their manuscript and ensure that the submission complies with the journal's Focus and Scope, Author Guidelines, publication ethics, and other applicable editorial policies.
- Authors must first **download** this template and prepare the complete manuscript using the downloaded file on their local computer. **Please do not prepare** or **edit** the manuscript directly in the online preview or browser-based version of the template.
- JUSIFO publishes research that makes a clear scholarly or practical contribution to the field of Information Systems. Manuscripts should clearly present a relevant research problem, establish the research gap or motivation, apply an appropriate methodology, provide adequate analysis and evaluation, and explain the contribution of the findings to knowledge or practice.
- **Line numbers** are provided in this template to facilitate editorial assessment and peer review. **Please do not remove** the line numbers from the manuscript submitted for review.
- **If you have any remaining questions**, please email our editorial team at jusifo@radenfatah.ac.id.
- **Before submitting your manuscript, please remove this instruction section and any guidance text intended only for authors. Keep all required publication statements, manuscript structure, and line numbers in the manuscript.**

PUBLICATION STATEMENTS

In addition to the main scientific content of the manuscript, authors must provide the publication statements listed below. These statements are required to support transparency, research integrity, authorship accountability, and compliance with the journal's publication policies.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

Authors must disclose the use of generative AI or AI-assisted technologies when such tools have made a substantive contribution to the preparation of the manuscript. The declaration should identify the tool or service used and clearly explain the purpose for which it was used.

Basic tools used only for spelling, grammar, punctuation, or routine reference management do not require disclosure. However, authors remain responsible for reviewing and verifying all content produced or assisted by AI technologies.

Generative AI tools or AI-assisted technologies cannot be listed as authors or co-authors. Authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, originality, appropriate citation, and overall content of the manuscript.

If generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used as part of the research methodology, such as for data processing, analysis, classification, prediction, modelling, coding, or other research procedures, their use must also be described in the relevant methodological section. Authors

should provide sufficient information about the tool, model, version, provider, purpose, procedures, parameters, prompts, or validation process where relevant.

EXAMPLE – Generative AI or AI-Assisted Technologies were used

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used [NAME OF TOOL / SERVICE] for [PURPOSE OF USE]. The authors subsequently reviewed, verified, and edited the AI-assisted output as necessary and take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, originality, and content of the manuscript.

EXAMPLE – No Reportable Use of Generative AI

The authors declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies requiring disclosure were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

CREDIT AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Authors must describe the contribution of each author using the **CRedit (Contributor Roles Taxonomy)**. The purpose of this statement is to provide transparency regarding the actual contribution made by each author to the research and manuscript.

Authors should assign only those roles that accurately reflect the work actually performed. Authors should not automatically assign all roles to every author.

The CRedit taxonomy includes 14 contributor roles: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, and Writing – review & editing. Need more information? Visit [CRedit – Contributor Role Taxonomy](#).

EXAMPLE

First Author Name: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing – original draft.

Second Author Name: Methodology, Validation, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Third Author Name: Software, Resources, Validation, Visualization, Writing – review & editing.

Where **two** or **more authors** contributed to the same activity, the same CRedit role may be assigned to more than one author.

Authors should review and agree on the contribution statement before submission and ensure that it accurately represents their respective contributions.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

Authors must disclose any financial, professional, institutional, personal, or other interests or relationships that could reasonably be perceived as influencing the conduct of the research, interpretation of the findings, preparation of the manuscript, or publication of the work.

A competing interest does not necessarily prevent publication. However, relevant relationships or interests must be disclosed transparently so that editors, reviewers, and readers can appropriately evaluate them.

Examples may include financial interests, employment relationships, consultancy arrangements, advisory roles, intellectual property interests, close professional relationships, or personal relationships that could reasonably be perceived as influencing the work.

EXAMPLE – No Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

EXAMPLE – A Competing Interest Exists

[AUTHOR NAME] has received [TYPE OF FINANCIAL / PROFESSIONAL / INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT] from [ORGANIZATION]. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors should provide sufficient information to explain the nature of any relevant competing interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The ACKNOWLEDGMENTS section should recognize individuals, institutions, organizations, or other contributors who provided meaningful assistance to the research or preparation of the manuscript but do not meet the criteria for authorship.

Acknowledged contributions may include technical assistance, administrative support, language editing, access to research facilities or data, assistance with data collection, intellectual discussion, logistical support, or other non-author contributions.

Authors should obtain permission from individuals before identifying them by name in the ACKNOWLEDGMENTS section where appropriate.

Financial support **should not be reported** as a substitute for the FUNDING section. Funding information must be provided separately under FUNDING.

EXAMPLE – Acknowledgment Exists

The authors would like to thank [NAME / INSTITUTION / ORGANIZATION] for [SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION OR SUPPORT].

For example:

The authors would like to thank the Information Technology Center of [INSTITUTION] for providing technical assistance and access to the data required for this study.

EXAMPLE – No Acknowledgments

The authors have no acknowledgments to declare.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Authors must provide a statement explaining the availability of the data or other research materials supporting the findings of the study.

The statement should allow readers to understand whether the supporting data can be accessed and, where applicable, how they can be obtained. Authors should not state that data are publicly available unless the data can actually be accessed using the information provided.

Where data cannot be shared publicly because of privacy, confidentiality, ethical, legal, contractual, or institutional restrictions, authors should clearly indicate the applicable restriction. Authors should select or adapt the statement that most accurately represents their study.

EXAMPLE – Data Available in a Public Repository

The data supporting the findings of this study are publicly available in [REPOSITORY NAME] at [DOI / URL / PERSISTENT IDENTIFIER].

EXAMPLE – Data Available Upon Reasonable Request

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

This statement should be used only when there is a legitimate reason why the data are not deposited in a public repository and when the authors are actually able to provide the data where appropriate.

EXAMPLE – Restricted Data

The data supporting the findings of this study are not publicly available due to [PRIVACY / CONFIDENTIALITY / ETHICAL / LEGAL / INSTITUTIONAL] restrictions.

Where appropriate, authors may explain whether access can be requested under specified conditions.

EXAMPLE – Data Included in The Article or Supplementary Materials

The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and/or its supplementary materials.

EXAMPLE – Publicly Available Secondary Data

The data analyzed in this study are publicly available from [DATABASE / REPOSITORY / ORGANIZATION] at [DOI / URL / IDENTIFIER].

EXAMPLE – No New Data

No new datasets were generated or analyzed in this study.

The “no new data” statement is generally appropriate for studies such as conceptual papers or other research for which no new or existing dataset was analyzed. Authors who analyze an existing public dataset should identify the source of that dataset rather than state that no data were analyzed.

FUNDING

Authors must disclose all financial support received for the research and, where applicable, preparation or publication of the manuscript.

The statement should include the official name of the funding agency, institution, organization, or program and the grant or award number where available.

Funding information should be reported separately from ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

EXAMPLE – Single Funding Source

This work was supported by [FUNDING AGENCY / INSTITUTION] under Grant [GRANT NUMBER].

EXAMPLE – Multiple Funding Sources

This work was supported by [FUNDING AGENCY #1] under Grant [GRANT NUMBER]; [FUNDING AGENCY #2] under Grant [GRANT NUMBER]; and [FUNDING AGENCY #3] under Grant [GRANT NUMBER].

EXAMPLE – Funding Without a Grant Number

This work was supported by [FUNDING AGENCY / INSTITUTION]. No grant number was assigned.

EXAMPLE – No External Funding

This research received no external funding.

Where a funding organization had a role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of the findings, preparation of the manuscript, or decision to submit the manuscript for publication, authors should disclose that role.

Where the funder had no involvement in these activities, authors may state:

The funder had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of the findings, preparation of the manuscript, or decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Authors must provide an ETHICS STATEMENT that is appropriate to the nature of the research and the data involved.

Research involving human participants, respondents, interviews, surveys, observations, focus groups, usability testing, experiments, interventions, identifiable personal data, or sensitive information should clearly state whether formal ethical approval was required and obtained.

Where formal ethical approval was obtained, authors should provide the name of the ethics committee, institutional review board, or approving institution, together with the approval or protocol number where available.

Where applicable, authors should also state whether participation was voluntary and whether informed consent was obtained from participants.

Authors should not assume that anonymous, online, or minimal-risk research is automatically exempt from ethical review. If formal ethical approval was not required, the authors should explain the basis for this determination and ensure that it is consistent with the applicable institutional, national, or disciplinary requirements.

EXAMPLE – Ethical Approval Obtained

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the [NAME OF ETHICS COMMITTEE / INSTITUTION] under approval number [APPROVAL NUMBER]. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants where applicable.

EXAMPLE – Formal Ethical Approval Not Required

Formal ethical approval was not required under the applicable [INSTITUTIONAL / NATIONAL] guidelines because the study involved [BRIEF DESCRIPTION AND REASON]. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants where applicable.

For example:

Formal ethical approval was not required under the applicable institutional guidelines because the study involved an anonymous, minimal-risk survey and did not collect sensitive or identifiable personal information. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

EXAMPLE – Secondary or Publicly Available Data

Formal ethical approval was not required because the study used publicly available secondary data containing no identifiable personal information and did not involve direct interaction with human participants. Authors should ensure that this statement is appropriate to the specific dataset and applicable ethical or institutional requirements.

EXAMPLE – Ethical Approval Not Applicable

Ethical approval was not applicable to this study because the research did not involve human participants, identifiable personal data, interventions, or other activities requiring ethical oversight.

For example, this statement may be appropriate for certain algorithmic experiments using non-human or fully public non-personal datasets, software engineering studies without human participants, conceptual studies, or other studies for which ethical oversight is not applicable.

Authors should provide a specific explanation appropriate to their study rather than using “not applicable” without justification.

MANUSCRIPT STRUCTURE AND SECTION GUIDANCE

Authors should prepare the manuscript according to the structure provided below. Each section should contain information appropriate to the research design and should be written clearly, concisely, and consistently. Authors may use subsections where necessary to improve the organization and readability of the manuscript.

TITLE

The title should be concise, specific, informative, and no more than 15 words. It should clearly represent the main topic or research problem addressed in the manuscript and enable readers to understand the focus of the study.

Avoid overly broad or generic titles, unnecessary words, uncommon abbreviations, and expressions that do not provide meaningful information about the study. Where appropriate, the title may indicate the principal phenomenon, method, system, technology, context, or object investigated, but it should not attempt to summarize the entire study.

Example:

Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Decision Support for Public Healthcare Service Management

AUTHOR NAMES AND AFFILIATIONS

Provide the full name of each author without academic degrees, professional titles, or job titles. Each author's affiliation **should include** the **department**, **institution**, and **country**. Provide a valid email address for each author.

Where authors have different affiliations, use superscript numbers to associate each author with the appropriate institution.

Identify the corresponding author using an asterisk (*). The corresponding author is responsible for communication with the journal during the submission, peer-review, revision, and publication processes.

Example:

First Author Name¹, Second Author Name², Third Author Name^{1*}

¹Department of Information Systems, University A, Country, Author Email

²Department of Computer Science, University B, City, Country, Author Email

*Corresponding author: author@university.edu

Authors should ensure that all names, affiliations, and email addresses are accurate and consistent with the information entered in the journal's submission system.

Because JUSIFO applies double-blind peer review, author-identifying information should be handled in accordance with the journal's anonymization requirements for the review version of the manuscript. JUSIFO's current submission requirements explicitly require authors to follow its double-blind review instructions.

ABSTRACT

The abstract should be written in English as a single, self-contained paragraph and provide a concise and factual summary of the study. It should enable readers to understand the essential elements of the research without consulting the full manuscript.

The abstract should clearly present:

- the **background** or **research problem**;
- the **objective** or **purpose** of the study;
- the **research method**, including essential information about the data, participants, research object, or analytical procedure where relevant;
- the **main results**, preferably including **specific findings** rather than general statements;
- the **conclusion** and principal contribution or implication of the study.

The abstract should focus on information actually reported in the manuscript. Avoid citations, extensive background information, undefined abbreviations, unsupported claims, and statements such as “the results **will be discussed...**” or “the study **is expected to...**” when the research has already been completed.

KEYWORDS

Provide 3–5 **keywords** or **key phrases** that accurately represent the principal concepts, research context, methodology, or subject area of the manuscript.

Keywords should be **sufficiently specific** to support **indexing**, **searchability**, and **discovery** of the article. Avoid overly general terms, unnecessary abbreviations, and long phrases. Use established terminology that researchers in the relevant field are likely to use when searching for literature.

The keywords should complement the title and abstract rather than simply reproduce the complete title.

Example:

Artificial intelligence; Decision support systems; Healthcare information systems; Public services

1. INTRODUCTION

The INTRODUCTION should establish why the study is needed, what problem it addresses, how it is positioned in relation to existing knowledge, and what contribution it intends to make.

Authors should develop the introduction logically from the broader research context toward the specific problem investigated. The section should normally address the following elements:

Research context and problem.

Introduce the relevant context and clearly identify the scientific, organizational, societal, or practical problem addressed by the study. Explain why the problem is important in the field of Information Systems.

State of the art.

Critically synthesize relevant previous studies rather than merely listing or summarizing them individually. Explain what is already known, what approaches have been used, and what important findings or limitations have emerged from previous research.

Research gap or motivation.

Clearly identify the unresolved issue, limitation, inconsistency, underexplored context, methodological weakness, or other reason that justifies the present study. The research gap should emerge logically from the literature reviewed and should not be stated merely as the absence of an identical previous study.

Research objective or research question.

Clearly state what the study aims to investigate, evaluate, explain, develop, compare, or understand. Where appropriate, provide explicit research questions or hypotheses.

Research contribution.

Explain how the study is expected to contribute to Information Systems knowledge or practice. The contribution may be theoretical, methodological, empirical, technological, organizational, or practical, but it should be clearly connected to the research problem and gap identified earlier.

For studies involving the development of an application or information system, implementation of an algorithm, artificial intelligence, data analytics, or other technologies, the INTRODUCTION should clearly explain the research problem addressed and the significance of investigating it, rather than focusing primarily on the technology being implemented.

Use relevant and sufficiently recent scholarly literature to support the research context, state of the art, and research gap.

The final part of the INTRODUCTION should make the objective of the study and its intended contribution clear to the reader. This strengthens the existing JUSIFO guidance, which currently requires the introduction to establish background, state of the art, the main research problem, and the purpose of the article.

2. SELECT THE STRUCTURE APPROPRIATE TO THE STUDY

Authors should select one methodological structure that best reflects the design and purpose of the study. Do not retain more than one option in the submitted manuscript.

OPTION A – 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Recommended for experimental, computational, system-development, design-oriented, artificial intelligence, machine-learning, data-analytics, algorithmic, and other empirical studies that require a conventional methods structure.

or OPTION B – 2. LITERATURE REVIEW, HYPOTHESES, AND METHODS

Recommended for theory-driven empirical studies in which theoretical constructs, relationships among variables, research models, and hypotheses form an important part of the research design.

or **OPTION C – 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS**

Only applicable to systematic literature reviews, systematic mapping studies, bibliometric reviews combined with systematic analysis, and other structured evidence-synthesis studies.

Select only the option that is appropriate to your study and delete the other alternatives before submission.

OPTION A – 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Recommended for **experimental, computational, system-development, design-oriented, AI, machine-learning, data-analytics, algorithmic, and other technical or empirical studies** where a conventional methods structure is appropriate.

The section should be organized into at least the following two main subsections:

2.1. Materials

Describe the research materials, data, objects, resources, instruments, or technological environment used in the study. In Information Systems research, “materials” are not limited to physical materials and may include datasets, participants or samples, organizations or case-study settings, documents, questionnaires, software, hardware, platforms, databases, APIs, sensors, research instruments, or other resources required to conduct the study.

Where applicable, authors should provide information on:

- the research object, study setting, participants, population, or sample;
- data sources, dataset characteristics, sample size, and data collection period;
- research instruments, questionnaires, measurement tools, or observation protocols;
- software, hardware, platforms, frameworks, libraries, or other technologies used;
- relevant inclusion, exclusion, or selection criteria; and
- the source, accessibility, and relevant characteristics of the materials or data.

Only information necessary to understand and evaluate the study should be included. Authors should clearly identify the source of datasets, instruments, software, or other materials obtained from external sources.

2.2. Methods

Describe how the research was conducted, including the procedures used to collect, prepare, analyze, develop, test, validate, and evaluate the research outcomes.

The methodological description should be sufficiently detailed to allow readers and reviewers to understand the research process, assess its rigor, and, where appropriate, reproduce or replicate the study.

Depending on the research design, this subsection may include:

- research design and research procedure;
- data collection procedures;
- data preprocessing or preparation;
- system or software development procedures;
- algorithms, models, techniques, or analytical methods;
- feature selection or feature engineering;

- experimental design and parameter configuration;
- training, validation, and testing procedures;
- baseline or comparison methods;
- system testing and evaluation procedures;
- evaluation metrics and performance measures;
- statistical analysis;
- validity and reliability procedures; and
- ethical procedures where applicable.

Authors **may** create additional sub-subsections under 2.2. METHODS where **necessary** to clearly organize the methodology.

OPTION B – 2. LITERATURE REVIEW, HYPOTHESES, AND METHODS

Recommended for **theory-driven empirical studies** in which the research model, theoretical constructs, relationships among variables, and hypotheses form an important part of the research design.

2.1. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundation

Present the theories, concepts, and relevant empirical literature used to establish the research model. The literature review should synthesize and critically evaluate previous research rather than provide a collection of definitions.

2.2. Research Model and Hypotheses

Explain the proposed relationships among constructs or variables and provide a clear theoretical and empirical justification for each hypothesis. Where appropriate, present the research model or conceptual framework in a figure.

2.3. Methods

Describe the research design, population and sampling procedure, participants or unit of analysis, measurement instruments, construct operationalization, data-collection procedure, validity and reliability assessment, analytical procedure, software used for analysis, and applicable ethical considerations.

Authors should explain why the selected analytical method is appropriate for answering the research questions or testing the proposed hypotheses.

OPTION C – 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

Only applicable to **systematic literature reviews, systematic mapping studies, bibliometric reviews combined with systematic analysis**, or other **structured evidence-synthesis studies**.

2.1. Review Background and Conceptual Basis

Provide only the theoretical or conceptual background necessary to understand the review problem and explain how the review differs from or extends previous reviews.

2.2. Review Methods

Clearly describe the review protocol and procedures, including where applicable:

- research questions;
- information sources or databases;

- search period;
- complete search terms or search strings;
- inclusion and exclusion criteria;
- document types and language restrictions;
- duplicate removal;
- screening and selection procedures;
- quality-assessment criteria;
- data-extraction procedure;
- coding or classification scheme;
- synthesis or analytical procedure; and
- procedures used to improve transparency and reproducibility.

Where applicable, authors should provide a **study-selection flow diagram**, such as **PRISMA**, and **clearly report the number of records identified, screened, excluded, and included**.

A **systematic review** should not be presented merely as a narrative summary of selected articles. The selection and synthesis procedures should be sufficiently transparent and systematic to allow readers to assess the completeness and rigor of the review.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section should present the findings of the study and provide a **critical interpretation of what those findings mean**.

The section should be organized around the research objectives, research questions, hypotheses, or major analytical themes rather than around the order in which the research activities were performed.

RESULTS

Present the findings clearly, accurately, and systematically. Tables, figures, models, diagrams, or other visual elements may be used where they improve understanding of the findings.

Authors should:

- provide sufficient evidence to support each major finding;
- report appropriate descriptive, statistical, experimental, qualitative, or other analytical results;
- present relevant evaluation results rather than only examples of system interfaces or application features;
- report comparison or baseline results where required by the research design; and
- avoid duplicating the same information extensively in both text and [tables or figures](#).

For system-development studies, **screenshots and descriptions of application features should not constitute the main research results**. The section should emphasize findings from testing, evaluation, user assessment, performance analysis, validation, or other evidence relevant to the research objectives.

Tables and Figures

All tables and figures must be placed within the manuscript near the relevant text where they are first discussed. Do not place tables or figures collectively at the end of the manuscript.

Authors should follow the requirements below:

- Number all tables and figures consecutively using Arabic numerals in the order in which they are first mentioned in the manuscript (e.g., **Table 1, Table 2, Figure 1, Figure 2**).
- Every table and figure must be referred to and explained in the main text. **Do not** include a table or figure without discussing its relevance to the study.
- Place the **table title above the table**. Table titles should be **left-aligned, bold**, and written in sentence case. The title should be concise and sufficiently descriptive to allow readers to understand what the table presents.
- Place the **figure caption below the figure**. Figure captions should be **center-aligned, bold**, and written in sentence case. The caption should clearly identify and briefly describe the content of the figure.
- Tables should be provided as **editable tables**, **not** as screenshots or images.
- Figures, diagrams, charts, and other graphical materials should be clear, legible, and of sufficient quality for publication. Text, symbols, labels, and legends should remain readable at the final publication.
- Avoid presenting the same information unnecessarily in multiple forms. Data already presented clearly in a table **should not** be repeated in another figure unless the additional visualization provides meaningful analytical value.
- The manuscript text should highlight and interpret the **important information** or **findings** shown in a table or figure rather than simply repeating every value or element.
- Where a table or figure is reproduced, adapted, or derived from another source, provide an appropriate **citation and source attribution**. Authors are responsible for obtaining any permission required for copyrighted material.
- Tables and figures should use consistent terminology, abbreviations, units, symbols, and notation throughout the manuscript.
- Any use of generative AI or AI-assisted technologies to create or substantially modify figures, diagrams, or other visual materials must comply with the journal's **Generative AI Policy** and be disclosed where required.

EXAMPLES

Table 1. Characteristics of the research dataset

Variable	Description	Type
Variable A	...	...
Variable B	...	...

[FIGURE]

Figure 1. Architecture of the proposed information system

Correct Title:

Table 1. Characteristics of the research dataset

Figure 1. Architecture of the proposed information system

Also correct when capitalization is required:

Table 2. Performance comparison of CNN and LSTM models

Figure 3. Data flow in the IoT-based monitoring system

Avoid:

Table 1. Characteristics of the Research Dataset

Figure 1. ARCHITECTURE OF THE PROPOSED INFORMATION SYSTEM

DISCUSSION

The discussion should go beyond restating the results. Authors should explain:

- what the findings mean;
- why the findings may have occurred;
- how the findings answer the research questions, objectives, or hypotheses;
- how the findings compare with relevant previous studies;
- where the findings agree with, extend, qualify, or differ from previous research;
- possible explanations for important or unexpected findings;
- the theoretical, methodological, organizational, technological, or practical implications of the findings where appropriate; and
- how the findings demonstrate the specific contribution of the study.

Claims of improvement, effectiveness, superiority, novelty, or practical value should be supported by appropriate evidence and comparison.

The discussion should use relevant scholarly references to position the findings within the existing body of knowledge. It should not merely repeat material already presented in the INTRODUCTION.

This is also consistent with JUSIFO's current guidance, which requires authors to connect findings to the original research objectives, provide scientific interpretation, and compare the results with previous investigators' findings.

4. CONCLUSION

The CONCLUSION should provide a **clear synthesis of the study and directly answer its research objective, research questions, or hypotheses.**

Authors should briefly present:

- the principal findings of the study;
- the main conclusion derived from those findings;
- the study's **specific contribution to Information Systems knowledge or practice**;
- relevant theoretical, methodological, organizational, or practical implications;
- important limitations that affect the interpretation or generalizability of the findings; and
- appropriate directions for future research where relevant (if any).

The conclusion should be based only on evidence presented and discussed in the manuscript. Avoid introducing new data, new analyses, unsupported generalizations, or claims that extend beyond the scope of the study.

The CONCLUSION **should not simply repeat the ABSTRACT or reproduce the Results and Discussion section.** It should explain what can reasonably be concluded from the study and why those conclusions matter.

JUSIFO's current Author Guidelines likewise require the conclusion to answer the research objectives, explain how the work advances existing knowledge, and avoid merely repeating the abstract or listing experimental results.

REFERENCES

The REFERENCES section should contain **only sources that are cited in the manuscript.** Every in-text citation must have a corresponding entry in the reference list, and every reference listed must be cited in the manuscript.

Authors are responsible for ensuring the relevance, quality, accuracy, and completeness of all references used.

Authors should follow the requirements below:

- Use **Mendeley** as the reference management application to manage citations and references consistently.
- Use the **American Psychological Association (APA) 7th Edition** citation and reference style throughout the manuscript.
- Prioritize relevant, peer-reviewed, and authoritative scholarly sources **that directly support the research problem**, theoretical or conceptual foundation, methodology, interpretation of findings, and discussion.
- At least **80% of the references should consist of journal articles, conference proceedings, or other research outputs published within the last five to ten years**, in accordance with the current JUSIFO Author Guidelines.
- Authors are encouraged to use recent literature to establish the current state of knowledge. **Older sources may be included** when they are seminal, foundational, methodologically important, or otherwise necessary for the study.
- Avoid relying excessively on textbooks, general websites, blogs, commercial webpages, or other non-scholarly sources when appropriate scholarly literature is available.
- Ensure that the references adequately represent the state of the art relevant to the study. A large number of references does not substitute for relevance, quality, and appropriate scholarly positioning.
- Provide a **DOI for each reference where one has been assigned.** Authors should verify that the DOI is **correct** and **accessible**. Do not add an incorrect or unrelated DOI merely to complete the reference information.
- Where a **DOI is not available** and a URL is appropriate for the source type, provide an accurate and accessible URL in accordance with APA 7th Edition.
- Carefully verify the reference metadata, including author names, publication year, article title, journal or proceeding title, volume, issue, page range or article number, and DOI or URL where applicable.

- Ensure that references imported into Mendeley are checked and corrected manually when necessary. Automatically imported metadata may contain errors and should not be accepted without verification.
- Use the **original source** whenever possible **rather than** citing a source indirectly through another publication.
- References should be presented consistently and formatted according to **APA 7th Edition**. **Do not** manually apply a different citation style to individual references.

In-Text Citations

Authors should use the author–date citation system according to APA 7th Edition and apply it consistently throughout the manuscript.

Authors are encouraged to use the **Mendeley citation feature** to insert and manage in-text citations directly in the manuscript. Using the Mendeley citation tool helps maintain consistency between in-text citations and the reference list and reduces formatting errors.

Where appropriate, authors may use Mendeley to insert citations in either narrative or parenthetical form.

Examples:

Narrative citation:

Author (2025) found that ...

Parenthetical citation:

(Author, 2025)

Two authors:

(Author & Author, 2025)

Three or more authors:

(Author et al., 2025)