

Reviewers' Guideline

The reviewers of the journal are expected to contribute in the realization of the aim of the journal and the University at large. As a professional activity, the following points are highly essential to be mainstreamed by the reviewers of the journal.

Contribution to editorial decisions: Peer review assists editors in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communications with authors, may assist authors in improving their manuscripts. Peer review is an essential component of formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of scientific endeavor.

Promptness: Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should immediately notify the editors and decline the invitation to review so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Confidentiality: Any manuscripts received for review are confidential documents and must be treated as such; they must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the Editor-in-Chief (who would only do so under exceptional and specific circumstances). This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

Objectivity: Reviewers are required to provide qualified and timely assessment of the scholarly merits of the manuscript. The reviewer takes special care of the real contribution and originality of the manuscript. The review must be fully objective. The judgment of the reviewers must be clear and substantiated by arguments, and shall be based on the evaluation points of the journal.

Acknowledgement of sources: Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that is an observation, derivation or argument that has been reported in previous publications should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also notify the editors of any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other manuscript (published or unpublished) of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest: The reviewer must not be in a conflict of interest with the authors or funders of research. If such a conflict exists, the reviewer is obliged to promptly notify the Editor-in-Chief/associate editor. The reviewer shall not accept for reviewing papers beyond the field of his/her full competence. Unpublished material disclosed in a submitted manuscript

must not be used in a reviewer's own research, circulation, quotation, citation or reference without the written consent of the authors. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for the reviewer's personal advantage. This applies also to invited reviewers who decline the review invitation.

Reviewers are expected to consider, but not limited to, the following issues for the review task:

- Is the manuscript original and topical? What does it add to the existing subject area?
- Is the topic of the manuscript appropriate for the journal? Is the information of significant interest to the broad readership of the journal?
- Is the writing concise, clear and easy to follow without repetition?
- Does the manuscript significantly contribute to the scientific literature on education?
- Can the drawbacks of the manuscript be resolved through the revision process?
- Is the aim clearly stated? Is the gap identified? Is/Are the research question/s raised significant in addressing the identified problem?
- Are the methodology/methods appropriate, scientifically sound, current, and described clearly enough that the work could be repeated by someone else?
- Is the research ethical and have the appropriate approvals/consent been obtained?
- Are appropriate statistical analyses used? Are they sufficiently justified and explained? Are statements of significance justified?
- When results are stated in the text of the paper, are they supported by data? Can you verify them easily by examining tables and figures? Are the data presented sufficient?
- Are all the tables and figures necessary, clearly labeled, well designed, and readily interpretable? Is the information in the tables and figures redundant?
- Are the conclusions consistent with the evidences and arguments presented (supported by the data/findings presented?)
- Are the references cited are the most appropriate to support the manuscript? Are citations provided for all assertions of fact not supported by the data in this paper? Are any key citations missing?
- Should any portions of the manuscript be expanded, condensed, combined, or deleted? (Please specify the portion).

- If the author's argument is significantly against the existing academic consensus, do they adequately support the case with data? If not, what would be required to make their case credible?

Review Form

KJE Manuscript Review Form

PART A: Editorial Office Only

Reviewer's Name	
E-Mail	
Manuscript number:	
Title	
Date Sent To Reviewer	
Date Expected From Reviewer (Review due date)	

PART B: Reviewer Only

Based on the comment, please provide rates for each points listed under the table below: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Very Good) (3 = Good) (4 = Fair) (5 = Poor) (NA = Not applicable). (Kindly Mark With An X)

No.	Evaluation points	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1	How relevant is the manuscript to the journal? /Contribution to academia/education improvement/						
2	Study gaps is well stated in current understanding/knowledge and gap filling statement is also included.						
3	Originality and topicality: How novel is the manuscript? Are the technical ideas presented new and timely?						
4	Methodology: Appropriateness of the research/study method/tool						
5	Correctness: Is the manuscript technically correct? Are the experiments performed/methods employed or the analysis presented valid and accurate?						
6	Are the inferences drawn relative to the objectives? Are the data presented support and sufficient for the conclusion reached?						
7	Strength of the linkage among manuscript sections. Are the objectives/research questions-method-result-discussion-conclusion strongly linked?						
8	Presentation: How well written is the article/paper? Writing concise, clear and easy to follow without repetition						
9	Language: Standard of the language						
10	Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables, if applicable						
11	Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper						

Comments to the Author:

Comments to the Editor(s):

Recommandation: (Kindly Mark with an X)

Accept As It Is	
Requires Minor Corrections	
Requires Major Revision	
Rejected	