

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW FORM**Confidentiality Notice**

The manuscript submitted for review is a confidential document. Reviewers are expected to treat the manuscript, its contents, data, results, and ideas as confidential and should not use, share, or reproduce any part of the manuscript without the permission of the Editor-in-Chief.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION**Manuscript Title:**

.....

Manuscript ID:

.....

Reviewer Name:

.....

Institution/Affiliation:

.....

Date of Review:

.....

B. GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Please assess the manuscript based on its scientific quality, originality, relevance, clarity, and contribution to knowledge.

1. Originality and Contribution to Knowledge

Does the manuscript present original work or provide a meaningful contribution to existing knowledge?

☐ Excellent☐ Very Good☐ Good☐ Fair☐ Poor**Reviewer's Comments:**

.....

.....
.....

2. Relevance to the Journal

Is the subject of the manuscript relevant to the scope and readership of the *Researchers Journal of Science and Technology*?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No

Comments:

.....
.....

3. Scientific and Technical Quality

Are the research problem, methodology, analysis, and interpretation scientifically sound?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Comments:

.....
.....
.....

4. Title and Abstract

Is the title clear, concise, and consistent with the content of the manuscript? Does the abstract adequately present the purpose, methodology, major findings, and conclusion of the study?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....
.....

5. Introduction and Statement of the Problem

Does the introduction provide adequate background to the study? Is the research problem clearly established? Are the objectives, research questions, hypotheses, or knowledge gaps clearly presented where appropriate?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....

.....

.....

6. Literature Review and Theoretical/Conceptual Background

Does the manuscript engage adequately with relevant and current literature? Does it clearly establish how the present study relates to previous research?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....

.....

7. Materials and Methods

Are the methods sufficiently clear and appropriate for the study? Is there enough information for another qualified researcher to understand, evaluate, or reproduce the work?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Comments:

.....

.....

.....

8. Results and Data Presentation

Are the results clearly presented and adequately supported by the data? Are the tables, figures, graphs, equations, and statistical analyses appropriate and correctly used?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....

.....

.....

9. Discussion and Interpretation

Does the discussion adequately explain the findings? Are the results appropriately compared with previous studies? Are the interpretations scientifically reasonable and supported by the evidence?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Comments:

.....

.....

10. Conclusion and Recommendations

Does the conclusion accurately reflect the findings of the study? Are the recommendations, where provided, relevant and supported by the results?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....

.....

11. References

Are the references relevant, adequate, properly cited, and reasonably current? Are the citations in the text consistent with the reference list?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....

.....

12. Language, Organization, and Presentation

Is the manuscript clearly written and logically organized? Are there significant problems with grammar, sentence construction, terminology, or overall readability?

- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Requires Minor Revision
- ☐ Requires Major Revision

Comments:

.....

C. MAJOR STRENGTHS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Please identify the main strengths of the manuscript. These may include originality, methodological strength, quality of data, relevance of the research problem, clarity of presentation, or potential contribution to the field.

.....

.....

.....

.....

D. MAJOR CONCERNS REQUIRING ATTENTION

Please identify the issues that should be addressed before the manuscript can be considered for publication. Where possible, kindly provide specific and constructive suggestions for improvement.

.....

.....

.....

.....

E. SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO THE AUTHORS

Please provide detailed comments that will help the authors improve the manuscript. Comments may be arranged according to page, section, paragraph, table, figure, or line number where appropriate.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

F. CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

These comments will not be shared directly with the authors. Please use this section for confidential observations concerning the scientific quality, originality, ethical issues, possible duplication, or any other matter that may assist the Editor in making a publication decision.

.....

.....

.....

G. ETHICAL AND PUBLICATION CONSIDERATIONS

Please indicate whether you have any concerns regarding the following:

1. Plagiarism or Significant Similarity

- ☐ No concern
- ☐ Possible concern
- ☐ Serious concern

Comments, if applicable:

.....

2. Duplicate or Redundant Publication

- ☐ No concern
- ☐ Possible concern
- ☐ Serious concern

3. Ethical Issues in the Research

- ☐ No concern
- ☐ Possible concern
- ☐ Serious concern

Comments, if applicable:

.....

4. Conflict of Interest

Do you have any personal, professional, financial, or academic relationship with the authors that may affect your impartiality?

☐ No

☐ Yes

If yes, please explain:

.....

H. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

After considering the manuscript as a whole, please select the recommendation that best reflects your assessment:

☐ **ACCEPT WITHOUT REVISION**

The manuscript is suitable for publication in its present form.

☐ **ACCEPT SUBJECT TO MINOR REVISION**

The manuscript is generally sound but requires limited corrections or clarification before publication.

☐ **MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED**

The manuscript has potential for publication but requires substantial revision and further evaluation.

☐ **REJECT AND RESUBMIT**

The manuscript requires extensive revision before it can be considered as a new submission.

☐ **REJECT**

The manuscript does not meet the scientific, methodological, originality, or editorial standards required for publication.

I. FINAL REVIEWER SUMMARY

In a few sentences, please summarize your overall assessment of the manuscript and indicate the most important action the authors should take.

.....

.....

.....

.....

Reviewer's Signature:

Date: