**Reviewer Guidelines**

**Before you accept or decline an invitation to review, please note the following questions:**

* **Is the article requested to be reviewed in accordance with your expertise?**If you receive a manuscript that covers topics that are not appropriate areas of your expertise, please notify the editor or recommend an alternative reviewer.
* **Do you have the time to review this paper?**The review process must be completed within two weeks. If you agree and require a longer period, notify the editor or suggest an alternative reviewer.
* **Is there any potential conflict of interest?**Meanwhile, conflicts of interest will not disqualify you as a reviewer, disclose all conflicts of interest to the editor before reviewing.

**Review Evaluation**

Your review result will help the editor to decide whether or not to publish the articles in our journal. The peer reviewer is responsible for critiquing by reading and evaluating manuscripts in the field of expertise, then giving constructive advice and honest feedback to the author of the article submitted. Peer reviewers discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, how to increase the strength and quality of the paper, and evaluate the relevance and authenticity of the manuscript.

**Conducting the Review**

**Title, abstract, and keywords.**

The title of the article should be concise, and informative, and describe the article’s content. The abstract should briefly describe the paper's contents: the objectives of the research, the methods, the results achieved, and the major conclusions. The keywords should be specific and reflect what is essential about the article.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating (underline one) | Bad | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| Reviewer comments |  | | | |
| Author response |  | | | |

1. **Problem Formulation.**

Problem recognition and its significance, Clear problem identification and Appropriate research questions, Coverage of problem complexity, and Well-defined objectives.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating (underline one) | Bad | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| Reviewer comments |  | | | |
| Author response |  | | | |

1. **Research Methodology.**

A concise explanation of research methodology is prevalent; Reasons to choose particular methods are well described; the Research design is accurate; Sample design is appropriate; the Data collection process is proper; Data analysis methods are relevant and state-of-the-art.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating (underline one) | Bad | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| Reviewer comments |  | | | |
| Author response |  | | | |

1. **Research Findings.**

Empirical and theoretical benefits; Economic benefits; Existence of new findings.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating (underline one) | Bad | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| Reviewer comments |  | | | |
| Author response |  | | | |

1. **References.**

References are thoroughly covered in the article; the Recency of references provided is strong; Citations and referencing are employed correctly and truthfully.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating (underline one) | Bad | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| Reviewer comments |  | | | |
| Author response |  | | | |

1. **Article’s Presentation and Systematic Order.**

Framework and The flow of article presentation, Readability, Grammar, and Writing style.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating (underline one) | Bad | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| Reviewer comments |  | | | |
| Author response |  | | | |

1. **Overall Evaluation**

The reviewer gives comments on how to improve the papers.

Reviewer recommendation (underlying the chosen one):

1. Rejected
2. Major revision\*
3. Minor revision\*
4. Accepted