Reviewer Guidelines

Ethical Duties and Professional Conduct

Peer reviewers carry out an essential role in safeguarding the quality, methodology, and academic validity of published works. Reviewers must treat all assigned manuscripts and corresponding data sets with strict confidentiality, ensuring they are never shared, discussed, or distributed to any unauthorized third parties. Feedback must remain completely professional, objective, and constructive, avoiding personal criticisms or inflammatory remarks.

Reviewers are expected to accept assignments exclusively within their proven domain of technical expertise and must decline invitations if the topic falls outside their knowledge base. Reviewers must respect designated deadlines and notify the Editor-in-Chief immediately if an extension is required or if a conflict of interest is identified. Reviewers must protect the double-blind framework by keeping their own identities hidden within any track changes or comments returned to the journal.

Standard Evaluation Framework for Research Articles

Reviewers assess original empirical and theoretical manuscripts across six foundational areas using a structured 1 to 5 scoring scale, where 1 signifies poor and 5 signifies excellent performance.

Evaluation Area	Core Assessment Criteria
1. Originality and Relevance	Assesses whether the topic is novel, directly within the journal scope, and contributes meaningfully to current academic dialogues.
2. Problem Statement	Evaluates whether the underlying research problem is clearly articulated and if the objectives are specific and aligned.
3. Methodology and Ethics	Determines if the research design is robust, described in sufficient detail to allow replication, and addresses ethical mandates.

Evaluation Area	Core Assessment Criteria
4. Analysis and Results	Ensures that data analyses are accurate and rigorous, results are presented clearly via tables/figures, and interpretations are consistent.
5. Presentation and Style	Checks structural organization, professional academic language, grammar, spelling, and adherence to citation styles.
6. Contribution and Impact	Measures the significance of the findings and the clarity of practical, policy, or theoretical implications.

Evaluation Framework for Graduate Research

Manuscripts submitted by graduate students are reviewed with a focus on constructive academic development, evaluating potential and progress rather than expecting seasoned professional experience.

Evaluation Dimension	Core Assessment Focus
Level of Expectation	Does the work reflect a high level of effort and structural understanding appropriate for a developing scholar?
Mentorship Feedback	Does the paper present solid potential for growth, offering clear entry points for constructive refinement?
Methodological Execution	Are the chosen research methods clear, correct, and properly executed, even if straightforward?
Originality and Focus	Does the manuscript locate a valid research gap and make a genuine attempt to provide clear data addressing it?
Clarity and Presentation	Is the narrative well-organized and comprehensible, ensuring minor linguistic errors do not block understanding?
Publication Potential	Does the text show true promise for eventual formal publication following targeted revisions?

Evaluation Framework for Educational Development

Applied papers, policy briefs, and design prototypes are evaluated specifically on their practical application, scalability, and impact on educational implementation.

Review Criteria	Core Assessment Focus
Applied Relevance	Focuses on actionable field knowledge, alignment with educational goals, and policy relevance.
Innovation and Design	Evaluates the originality of the practical strategy, prototype, or program design introduced.

Review Criteria	Core Assessment Focus
Practical Application	Measures the utility of the insights within real-world educational contexts, training setups, or schools.
Policy and Practice Impact	Assesses the potential of the project to change teaching methods, learning outcomes, or administrative policy.
Clarity of Prototypes	Ensures case studies, technical models, or field designs are described with rich, clear replication detail.
Evidentiary Quality	Verifies that practical insights are backed by solid pilot data, program evidence, or case records.
Transferability	Determines if the innovative practices can be scaled, adapted, or applied to different regions or contexts.

Reviewer Recommendations and Decisions

Reviewers synthesize their evaluation into an explicit final recommendation selected from four distinct options: Accept Without Revisions (the paper meets all professional standards and is ready for production), Accept With Minor Revisions (the paper is academically sound but requires small adjustments to text, clarity, or citations), Major Revisions Required (the manuscript holds promise but requires extensive reworking of data, argument, or methodology), or Reject (the paper fails to meet journal standards, framework, or scope).