

Dear Reviewer,

You may please...

1. complete the review within 4-6 weeks,
2. return the completed MEF to: editor@ijbit.org
3. return the material if you cannot or desire to review this paper;
4. evaluate manuscript on merit,
5. use "Comments for Authors" sheet, which will be forwarded to the author,
6. express your opinion for acceptance or rejection under "*Confidential Comments to Editor*"

Regards,
Chief Editor, IJBIT

MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION FORM (MEF)

Reviewer's Name:	
E-mail:	
Date sent to reviewer:	Date expected from reviewer:

Paper title:
Manuscript / Job No.:

Reviewer's comments

	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
1. The originality of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
2. Novelty of the concept.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
3. The theoretical framework and research design of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
4. Appropriateness of methodology.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:



5. Quality and the adequacy of literature review.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

6. Novelty of findings.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

7. Validation of findings and solution.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

8. Academic or managerial implications.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

9. Contributions to the literature.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

10. Reliability and quality of referencing.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

11. Scope for further research.	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
	▣	▣	▣	▣	▣

Comment:

Overall Evaluation:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Outstanding | ▣ |
| 2. Definitely publishable | ▣ |
| 3. Probably publishable | ▣ |
| 4. Marginally publishable | ▣ |
| 5. Un-publishable | ▣ |

Recommendation:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Accept as it is | ▣ |
| 2. Requires minor corrections | ▣ |
| 3. Requires moderate revision | ▣ |
| 4. Requires major revision | ▣ |
| 5. Submit to another publication | ▣ |

Confidential comments to the editor

(This will not be forwarded to the authors:



Comments for author(s)

Submit the form to Chief Editor: editor@ijbit.org
