

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW SHEET
A Double-Blinded Review Process

Title:

A. EVALUATION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF MANUSCRIPT

| No. | Question | Answer | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----|--------|
| | | YES | NO | REASON |
| 1. | Does the title describe the content of the manuscript? | | | |
| 2. | Does the abstract reflect the overall content of the manuscript? | | | |
| 3. | Are the problem(s) and objective(s) presented in the introduction adequately addressed in the discussion? | | | |
| 4. | Are the data presented reliable and valid to address the problem(s)? | | | |
| 5. | Is the method or approach appropriate? | | | |
| 6. | Is the data analysis in accordance with the theoretical framework? | | | |
| 7. | Are the references relevant? | | | |
| 8. | Does the conclusion address the problem(s) in accordance with the data analysis? | | | |
| 9. | Does the manuscript contain novelty in its idea, method, or conclusion? | | | |

B. EVALUATION OF THE LANGUAGE OF MANUSCRIPT

| Question | Answer | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|----|--------|
| | YES | NO | REASON |
| Does the language adequately convey the author's idea? | | | |

C. DECISION

| No. | Decision | Answer | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----|
| | | YES | NO |
| 1 | The manuscript can be published directly | | |
| 2 | The manuscript can published after being revised by the author | | |
| 3 | The manuscript cannot be published | | |

D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS FROM PEER REVIEWER

Yogyakarta, _____, 2022
Blind Peer-Review