

Appendix 13: EJSSD Articles Evaluation Sheet

1. Originality:

- ✓ Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication in EJSSD?

2. The Abstract:

- ✓ Does the Abstract appropriately summarize the manuscript?
- ✓ Are there discrepancies between the Abstract and the remainder of the Manuscript? Can the Abstract be understood without reading the manuscript?

3. The Introduction:

- ✓ Is the Introduction concise?
- ✓ Is the purpose of the study clearly defined?
- ✓ Do the authors provide a rationale for performing the study based on a review of the literature? If so, is it of the appropriate length?
- ✓ If this manuscript is Original Research, is there a well-defined hypothesis? Mathematically the problem is well defined and studied.

4. Relationship to Literature:

- ✓ Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources?
- ✓ Is any significant work ignored?

5. Methodology:

- ✓ Are the methods employed appropriate/based on theory, concepts, or other ideas?
- ✓ Do the authors justify any choices available to them in their study design (e.g., choices of imaging techniques, analytic tools, experimental methods or statistical methods)? If the authors have stated a hypothesis, have they designed methods that could reasonably allow their hypothesis to be tested?

6. Results:

- ✓ Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately?
- ✓ Does the order of presentation of the results parallel the order of presentation of the methods?
- Are the results reasonable and expected, or are they unexpected?
- ✓ Are there results that are introduced that are not preceded by an appropriate discussion in the Methods section? No

7. Discussion:

- ✓ Is the discussion concise? If not, how should it be shortened?
- ✓ If a hypothesis was proposed, do the authors state whether it was verified or falsified? Alternatively, if no hypothesis was proposed, do the authors state whether their research question was answered?
- ✓ Are the authors' conclusions justified by the results found in the study?
- ✓ Do the authors note limitations of the study?
- ✓ Are there additional limitations that should be noted?

8. Implications for research, practice and/or society:

- ✓ Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice?
- ✓ What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)?
- ✓ Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

9. Quality of Communication:

- ✓ Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership?

10. Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.

11. Figures & Tables:

- ✓ Are the figures and graphs appropriate and are they appropriately labeled?
- ✓ Do the figures and graphs adequately show the important results?
- ✓ Do the figure legends provide a clear explanation that allows the figures and graphs to be understood without referring to the remainder of the manuscript?

12. The References Section

- ✓ Does the reference list contain errors?
- ✓ Have the authors appropriately represented the salient points in the articles in the reference list? Alternatively, have the authors misquoted the references? Are there more references than are necessary? No

Summary Recommendation for publication

Accepted With minor revision

Accepted pending revision
Reconsider after major revision

Reject

Reviewer's Name Dr./ Mr/Mrs _____ Signature  Date _____