REVIEWER EVALUATION FORM

Ar-Fachruddin : Journal of Islamic Education

Date: dd/mm/yyyy

Reviewer :

Title of Manuscript:

Integrating AI Chatbots into Islamic Education: Effects on Students' Self-Regulated and Learning Outcomes at SMP IT Pondok Tahfizh Qur'an, Kepulauan Bangka Belitung

_____

_____

REVIEW ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Criteria	Score (1–5)	Comments
Title: Straightforward, informative, and represents the contents of the article.		
Abstract: Concise but at least contain the problem, purpose, method, important findings, and implications of the research.		
Keywords: Searchable via search engines, accurately reflecting the research objective. Do not use phrases—only single words. Five keywords are recommended, with a minimum of three required.		
Introduction: Directing the reader about the importance of the research. Presenting significant problems, a clear state of the art, gap analysis, and novel concepts to fill the gaps. End it with the purpose of the research.		
Method: Clear and replicable. Reveals how research objectives are achieved with the appropriate tools, procedures, and stages.		
Results: Presenting experimental or survey data, or any other kind of data depending on the type of research. The results are generally presented in clear and readable tables and figures.		
Discussion: Meaningful. A good discussion is written as a dialogue that reveals the progress of the research in comparison to previous researches.		
Conclusion: This contains a summary of research results (the most important research finding) that relates to the objectives written in the introduction.		
References: Accountable, about 80% of the kinds of literature from primary sources (reputable journals) and up to date (last 10 years). Use reference management tools.		
Final Average Score:	**[ ]**	

Description: Very Poor /Poor/ Fair/ Good/ Excellent

Score	Description
5	**Excellent** – The criterion is fulfilled exceptionally well, with no significant weaknesses. The article demonstrates strong academic merit, originality, and outstanding clarity.
4	**Good** – The criterion is met effectively, although there are minor areas for improvement. The article is publishable with minor revisions.
3	**Fair** – The criterion is generally met, but there are noticeable weaknesses that require substantial revision. The article has potential for publication after further improvement.
2	**Poor** – The criterion is insufficiently met. The article requires major revision and fundamental improvements in structure, methodology, or scholarly contribution.
1	**Very Poor** – The criterion is not met. The article is not suitable for publication in its current form and needs a complete rewrite or restructuring.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

[ ] Accept As Is
[ ] Accept with Minor Revision
[ ] Major Revision Required
[ ] Reject

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS / NOTES FOR AUTHORS

_____

_____

_____