

1. Submission



2. Review Process from two reviewers



Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical

Good

fashion?)::

Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?)::

Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper:

Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:

Good

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper:

Good

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases:

Good

 $\label{thm:continuous} \textbf{Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables:}$

Fair

Technical (6): Discussion and conclusions:

Fair

Technical (7): Reference list, adequate and correctly cited:

Fair

Explanations for the above ratings and other general comments on major issues:

Beginning with your methods should naturally lead to your results and discussion. Cover your population, protocols, analysis, and results before linking back to the original question posed by your research. End your discussion by evaluating the limitations of your study and how your results relate to current literature.

Comments on the minor details of the article:

Manage your references easily with software like EndNote or Zotero. Use the reference style preferred by the journal you are submitting to. Ensure the right readers can find your article by selecting keywords for online publication databases. Test keywords by searching among already published papers.





Reviewer B:

Significance (- How important is the work reported? Does it attack an important/difficult problem (as opposed to a peripheral/simple one)? - Does the approach offered advance the state of the art? - Does it involve or synthesize ideas, methods, approaches from multiple disciplines? - Does it have interesting implications for multiple disciplines?)::

Good

Originality (- Is this a new issue? Is this a novel approach to an issue? -Is this a novel combination of familiar ideas/techniques/methods/approaches? - Does the paper point out differences from related research? - Does the paper properly situate itself with respect to previous work?)::

Good

Quality (- Is the paper technically sound? How are its claims backed up? -Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contribution?)::

Good

Clarity (- Is the paper clearly written? Does it motivate the research? Does it describe clearly the methods employed (e.g., experimental procedures, algorithms, analytical tools), if any? - Are the results, if any, described and evaluated thoroughly? - Is the paper organized in a sensible and logical fashion?)::

Good

Relevance (- Is the paper closely related to the theme of the journal (broadly conceived)? - Is the content interesting enough to a broad audience? - Is the paper readable in a multi-disciplinary context?):: Good

Technical (1): Structure of the paper.

Good

Technical (2): Standard of English:

Good

Technical (3): Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper: Fair

Technical (4): Use and number of keywords/key phrases: Good

Technical (5): Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables: Fair

← Reply

→ Forward

9 of 12 〈 **>** ■ ▼

3. Editorial Decision: ACCEPTED

