To be filled by the JSALT admin	
A). Research paper details	
1. Title of the paper	
2. Full paper ID	
To be filled by the reviewer	
B). Reviewer feedback for research paper (scores)	
ORIGINALITY *Please comment whether this paper contains new and significant information adequate to justify publication and fill research and/or practical gaps in the field of research.*	☐ 5 – Excellent, ☐ 4 – Good, ☐ 3 – Satisfactory, ☐ 2 – Weak, ☐ 1 – Unsatisfactory **Comments to Author(s)**
ABSTRACT	☐ 5 – Well summarized the content ☐ 4 – Explains well, ☐ 3 – Satisfactory ☐ 2 – Weak ☐ 1 – Not adequately summarized **Comments to Author(s)**
LITERATURE REVIEW *Review whether this paper comprehensively reviewed the theory and literature related to the research topic and critically analysed the literature on developing the research gap, hypotheses, research questions and objectives.*	☐ 5 – Highly Appropriate, ☐ 4 – Fits enough, ☐ 3 – Satisfactory, ☐ 2 – Can be improved, ☐ 1 – Not appropriate **Comments to Author(s)**
METHODOLOGY: *Review whether the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas, and/or whether the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed, and/or whether the methods employed appropriate to achieve the research objectives and to answer the research questions.*	☐ 5 – Highly Appropriate ☐ 4 – Fits enough ☐ 3 – Satisfactory ☐ 2 – Can be improved, ☐ 1 – Not appropriate **Comments to Author(s)**
ANALYSIS *Review whether the appropriate analytical techniques are used, and/or whether the techniques are appropriate to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses developed in the research*.	☐ 5 – Excellent ☐ 4 – Good ☐ 3 – Satisfactory, ☐ 2– Weak ☐ 1 – Unsatisfactory **Comments to Author(s)**
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS *Review whether results are presented clearly and analysed appropriately, also review the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper and discussed and justified the results adequately.*	☐ 5 – Well presented, ☐ 4 – Adequately presented, ☐ 3 – Satisfactory, ☐ 2 – Weakly presented ☐ 1 – Unsatisfactory **Comments to Author(s)**

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH, PRACTICE AND/OR SOCIETY *Review whether the paper clearly identify any implications for research, practice and/or society, the paper bridges the gap between theory and practice, this research can be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)*	☐ 5 – Excellent, ☐ 4 – Good, ☐ 3 – Serves the purpose, ☐ 2 – Weak, ☐ 1 – Need improvements
	Comments to Author(s)
QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION *Review whether this paper clearly expresses its arguments clearly, measured against the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership.*	☐ 5 – Excellent, ☐ 4 – Good, ☐ 3 – Serves the purpose, ☐ 2 – Weak, ☐ 1 – Need improvements
	Comments to Author(s)
C). Reviewer feedback for research paper in detail	
Final decision	☐ 7 – Strong Accept, ☐ 6 – Accept, ☐ 5 – Weak Accept, ☐ 4 – Borderline Paper, ☐ 3 – Weak Reject, ☐ 2 - Reject, ☐ 1 - Strong Reject
Any other comments to the Author(s)	
D). Reviewer's details	
I. Reviewer's confidence in reviewing the paper	☐ 4 – Very confident, ☐ 3 – Confident, ☐ 2 – Somewhat, ☐ 1 – Not Confident
II. Title of the Reviewer	☐Prof. ☐Dr. ☐ Eng. ☐ Mr. ☐Ms. ☐ Mrs. Other ……..
III. Name of the Reviewer (as preferred to appear in the JSALT website)	
IV. Affiliated Institution	
E). Other remarks to author/ editorial committee	