

Greetings and thank you for lending your expertise and experience as a journal reviewer.

Individuals serving as reviewers are performing an important and valuable job, assuring that the manuscripts they evaluate are being published with integrity and accuracy.

As a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), JICHI takes great pride in ensuring that the highest level of care is taken to administer a robust double-blind peer review process on each and every journal manuscript submitted to JICHI journal publication.

Please take a moment to read through the review criteria below, and in addition you will also find a sample evaluation.

With deepest appreciation,

Ahmad Ilham
Editor in Chief, JICHI

Review Criteria

As a reviewer, your comments are valuable to the advancement of your colleagues research, even if the manuscript is not, in your opinion, publishable.

All reviews should be conducted through the open journal system (OJS) by the assigned due date. Reviewers who complete high-quality reviews in a timely manner are providing an essential service to the field and to the journal.

Please carefully read each manuscript, supporting your evaluation with relevant citations and with the goal of helping the authors construct a more rigorous research work by providing constructive feedback. Provide an honest assessment of the value of the manuscript. Begin by providing your overall assessment of the work, followed by a specific list of comments. Please bear in mind that although grammatical corrections are valuable, the review must stretch beyond the use of punctuation, spelling, and language usage.

An appropriate evaluation includes an analysis of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses, suggestions on how to make it more complete, relevant, and readable, as well as specific questions for the authors to address. Provide advice that leads to action. Vague statements and no points of action do not provide goals for the authors and will hinder any subsequent revisions.

Avoid making derogatory and unprofessional comments. If you do not find the manuscript publishable, extensive comments regarding why the paper is not acceptable and constructive directions for future submissions should still be provided. A decision to reject the manuscript, with no feedback to the authors, does not help them advance their skills.

As such, while conducting your review, consider the following questions:

Is the manuscript in congruence with the mission of the journal?

How useful is the material to the field?

Does the manuscript clearly state the issue being addressed?

Does the literature review contain relevant information in support of the manuscript?

Does the manuscript contain a detailed explanation of research methods and procedures?

Is the manuscript clearly organized in a logical fashion?

Are the author's conclusions supported by the research?

Additional tips for improving your review:

Provide the page number and explicitly state the areas of the manuscript to which you are referring.

Consider providing relevant citations to the authors to improve the work.

Do not forget to assess the tables, figures, and diagrams.

Sample Evaluation

REVIEWER 1

Reviewer Information

Evaluation submitted: Mar 19, 2021

Overall Evaluation

Do you feel the article manuscript adequately adheres to the mission and scope of the journal?

Yes

If no, how could this be improved?

N/A

Do you feel that this topic is timely?

Yes

If no, how could the topic become more relevant?

N/A

Do you feel that the data presented and analyzed is adequate?

No

If no, how could the data be better presented?

...

On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you rank the quality of research design?

2

If less than 3, please offer constructive suggestions for improvement:

18 interviews is fine method. However, the authors claimed they use only those 18 interviews as a grounded theory, and build a new theory for an unknown field, which is too big of a claim.

On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you rank the legitimacy of the conclusions formed within the article manuscript?

2

If less than 3, please offer constructive suggestions for improvement:

Authors should scale down their claims of the theory contributions of the study.

On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you rank the practical and managerial significance of the work?

3

If less than 3, please offer constructive suggestions for improvement:

N/A

On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you rank the clarity of the information presented?

3

If less than 3, please offer constructive suggestions for improvement:

N/A

On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you rank the references used? Specifically, whether they are sufficient, appropriate, and up-to-date?

2

If less than 3, please offer constructive suggestions for improvement and please list a few reference sources that you recommend be utilized and cited:

References are relevant. However, need to add more recent citations. This field is rapidly changing. Authors barely included the most recent few years of citations.

In your opinion, what are the overall weaknesses of the article manuscript? Please carefully list specific suggestions for improvement and/or enhancement (Mandatory):

The paper claimed to use grounded theory to build a new theory, however, only 18 interviews are not enough to build a new theory as the authors claimed. The research question is too big to be answered by just 18 interviews. Author did not really make it clear how the content analysis, and qualitative data analysis was conducted, and how some of the quotes were selected, and other are not. Also not clear about the interviewee selection process. Did not mention the interviewers' credentials. Should provide much richer data than what currently presented. The conclusions drawn is premature, again, 18 interviews are not enough to build the

theory.. Authors should acknowledge this limitation, and either add more qualitative data, or scales down on the claiming of using grounded theory to build a new theory.

In your opinion, what are the overall strengths of the article manuscript? (Mandatory):

The topic is very interesting. Privacy should be everybody's concerns, yet, not many people understand it when they use Smartphones. This paper did a good job to raise the awareness of this issue. The qualitative analysis of the paper is very interesting to read. Author presented the interview data well, and keep the reading interested in reading the findings of the research. A good attempt to build a theory for the topic, should be helpful to contribute to the knowledge of the field. Literature review is good and used appropriately. Although recommend authors to add more most recent literature.

Please provide any additional constructive comments to the author(s) for improving and revising the manuscript (Optional):

I would recommend the authors to add more data analysis, and present richer qualitative data for the paper. Also explain the data analysis process more, such as how those categories were emerged, how content analysis was conducted etc. . Maybe also consider to add some more quantitatively summarized data from the interview data. Provide clear and better explanations for the research design, why grounded theory, interviewer selection, interview guild development, interviewer credential, Try to scale down of claiming of grounded theory, and the generalization of the research model and consultation. Acknowledge the limitation of 18 interviews is not enough to build a new theory and answer the big research question. .

Your Editorial Decision:

Accept After Specified Revisions

Overall Comments to the Editor(s)-in-Chief:

Interesting topic and interesting read. The paper kept me interested reading, which is rare for an academic paper. So I think there is a practical implantations. However, I do have concerns of authors only used 18 interviews to claim as used a grounded theory to answer a way to big research question. Therefore, I think it is marginal acceptance, leaning toward rejection. Depends on authors ability to address my major theory and data analysis concerns. If authors are able to address those concerns, then I am Ok with acceptance because of the infesting topic. However, if authors are unable (or unwilling) to address them, it doesn't have enough theory contributions for the publication, then I recommend rejection.