

Appendix 1 PAPER ASSESSMENT FORM – *For Reviewers Only*

- **Paper Title:**

- **Paper Author(-s):** This section is obliterated by the Editorial Team.

- **Keywords:**

PAPER EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluation Result:

Score:

Criteria

Criteria Scores	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent
Title and abstract (does it reflect/represent the content of the paper?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall quality of content, research approach	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Significance, applicability, scientific impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Originality/innovation and complexity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation and quality of writing (English)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coverage of literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please note that scores must be between 1 and 5.

Interpretation:

- 0 – The paper fails to address the criterion.
- 1 – Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are a large number of shortcomings.
- 2 – Fair. The paper addresses the criterion, but there are significant shortcomings.
- 3 – Good. The paper addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are still present.
- 4 – Very good. The paper addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5 – Excellent. The paper successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion.

Justification of the Scores

Criterion 1: Title and Abstract

Criterion 2: Overall Quality of Content, Research Approach

Criterion 3: Significance, Applicability, Scientific Impact

Criterion 4: Originality/Innovation and Complexity

Criterion 5: Presentation and Quality of Writing

Criterion 6: Coverage of Literature

Recommendation to Editors

	Strongly reject	Reject	Marginally accept	Accept	Strongly accept
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Further Comments by the Reviewer (Not mandatory):