

Reviewer Evaluation Form – Standard

Please evaluate each component of the manuscript using the following categories:

A = fully satisfactory; **B** = satisfactory; **C** = unsatisfactory; **N/A** = not applicable

NOTE: The evaluations and comments provided in the following sections will be forwarded to the author(s).

1. Title*

Is it appropriate and concise?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

2. Abstract*

Is the quality and length appropriate?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

3. Aim(s) of the Study*

Are the aims clearly stated?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

4. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework*

Is the theoretical framework clearly defined, relevant, and adequately grounded in the literature?

- A = completely satisfactory

- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

5. Methodology*

Is the research design appropriate and sufficiently described?

Is the method appropriate? Is the sampling procedure described in sufficient detail? Are the instruments adequately presented? Is the data analysis appropriate given the aims and the nature of the data?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

6. Results*

Are the results presented clearly and in an organised manner? Are the results of the statistical analyses reported accurately? Are tables, graphs, and figures appropriately presented, titled and labelled? Is there any unnecessary duplication in the presentation of results?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

7. Discussion*

Does the discussion interpret the results in relation to the research aims? Does the discussion interpret the results in relation to relevant theories and previous studies?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

8. Contribution to the Field*

Does the manuscript make a meaningful or original contribution to the field?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

9. Strengths, Limitations and Future Direction*

Are the strengths of the study clearly identified? Are the limitations of the study clearly acknowledged? Are recommendations for future research clearly provided?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

10. Conclusions*

Are the conclusions clearly linked to the research aims? Do they follow logically from the results? Are they well-argued? Are they clear and unambiguous? Do they avoid unnecessary repetition of data or results?

If applicable, are the practical implications or recommendations for improving professional practice clearly stated?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

11. Structure of the Manuscript*

Is the manuscript organised in accordance with the Instructions for Authors and APA 7 standards?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

12. Quality and Clarity of the Text*

Is the manuscript clearly written, linguistically correct, and in line with academic writing standards?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

13. Literature*

Is the cited literature relevant and adequate?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory
- N/A = not applicable

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

Article Category*

Please indicate the most appropriate category for this manuscript.

For editorial purposes only; not visible to the author(s).

- Original scientific paper
- Review paper
- Short communication
- Professional paper
- Scientific critique / debate / commentary

Reviewer Comments for Author and Editor

Reviewer Comments for Editor Only

Reviewer Declaration on Confidentiality and AI Use*

I confirm that I have not uploaded or shared the author manuscript with any third-party tool or service and that I have not used generative AI to produce this reviewer report.

- I confirm

Reviewer Evaluation Form – Review Paper

Please evaluate each component of the manuscript using the following categories:

A = fully satisfactory; **B** = satisfactory; **C** = unsatisfactory

NOTE: The evaluations and comments provided in the following sections will be forwarded to the author(s).

1. Title*

Is it appropriate and concise?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

2. Abstract*

Is the abstract clear, informative, and appropriate in length?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

3. Aim(s) of the Study*

Are the aims clearly stated and appropriate for a review/theoretical paper?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

4. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework*

Is the theoretical framework clearly defined, relevant to the topic and adequately grounded in existing literature?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

5. Literature Coverage*

Is the literature relevant, comprehensive, and appropriate for the topic?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

6. Analytical Depth and Synthesis*

Does the manuscript provide critical analysis and synthesis, integrating theories and previous research rather than mere description?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

7. Contribution to the Field*

Does the manuscript make a meaningful contribution to advancing knowledge in the field? Does it offer a novel perspective, framework, or interpretation? Does it critically reflect on its limitations and provide directions for future research or development of the field?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

8. Conclusions*

Are the conclusions clear, well-argued, and consistent with the aims of the paper?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

9. Structure and Organisation*

Is the manuscript well-structured and logically organised?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

10. Quality, Clarity, and Academic Style*

Is the manuscript clearly written, linguistically correct, and in line with academic writing standards?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

11. References*

Are the references relevant, up to date, and properly formatted?

- A = completely satisfactory
- B = satisfactory
- C = unsatisfactory

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

Article Category*

Please indicate the most appropriate category for this manuscript.

For editorial purposes only; not visible to the author(s).

- Original scientific paper
- Review paper
- Short communication
- Professional paper
- Scientific critique / debate / commentary

Reviewer Comments for Author and Editor

Reviewer Comments for Editor Only

Reviewer Declaration on Confidentiality and AI Use*

I confirm that I have not uploaded or shared the author manuscript with any third-party tool or service and that I have not used generative AI to produce this reviewer report.

- I confirm

Reviewer Evaluation Form – Book Review / Report

Please evaluate each component of the paper.

NOTE: The evaluations and comments provided in the following sections will be forwarded to the author(s).

Relevance of the Work*

Is the book/case/event/dataset/editorial/commentary relevant to the field and readership of the journal?

- Yes
- No
- To some extent

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

Quality of the Analysis*

Does the paper go beyond a summary and provide a critical evaluation?

- Yes
- No
- To some extent

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

Clarity and Structure*

Is the paper well-organised and clearly written?

- Yes
- No
- To some extent

Comments / Suggestions for improvement: _____

Article Category*

Please indicate the most appropriate category for this manuscript.

For editorial purposes only; not visible to the author(s).

- Informative article (editorial, commentary, etc.)
- Report/Review (e.g. book, case, event, dataset)

Reviewer Comments for Author and Editor

Reviewer Comments for Editor Only

Reviewer Declaration on Confidentiality and AI Use*

I confirm that I have not uploaded or shared the author manuscript with any third-party tool or service and that I have not used generative AI to produce this reviewer report.

- I confirm