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# A. Summary of paper

Please summarize the paper under review. What are the main objectives of the paper, the method, results and implications? (approx. ¼-½ page)

# B. General issues with the paper

## B.1 Does the title correspond to the content of the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.2 Is the abstract reflecting the key points of the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.3 Do the keywords correspond to the content of the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

New keywords to be added:

Keywords that do not correspond to the content:

## B.4 Does the **introduction** introduce all the intended readers of this paper to the research study?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.5 Does the **introduction** follow the funnel approach?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.6 Does the research **objective** of the paper have academic and/or professional relevance in the field of study?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| None | Low | Adequately | High | Very high |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.7 Is the **objective** of the paper well written and motivated in the **introduction**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.8 Is the **theory** relevant for the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.9 Have all important and relevant **theories** been used and cited by the author(s)?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

If No, list and describe theories might be missing or should be changed:

## B.10 Are the **methods** well-chosen and correctly applied for the respective field of investigation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.11 Are the **methods** used correctly in the research study?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.12 What is the perceived quality of the **results**?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.13 Are the **discussion** and the **conclusions** reflecting the theoretical framework presented in the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.14 Are the **discussion** and the **conclusions** reflecting the results of investigation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.15 Are the **discussion** and the **conclusions** reflecting the objective of the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.16 How is the ***validity*** of the results/conclusions of the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.17 How is the ***reliability*** of the results/conclusions of the paper?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

Motivate decision:

## B.18 Comments about general issues of the paper (not stated above):

# C. Technical issues with the paper

## C.1 Does the paper conform to the guidelines/template?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

If No, list the problems:

## C.2 Are the tables, charts, figures, illustrations etc. congruent with the text?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

## C.3 Are the tables, charts, figures, illustrations etc. readable and clearly presented?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

## C.4 Are the listed references congruent with referencing system?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

## C.5 Are there any missing information in the references?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

## C.6 Are any used literature sources missing in the reference list or vice versa?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  | No |  | N/A |

## C.7 Are the language and grammar of the paper satisfactory?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |  | N/A |

## C.8 Is the tense used in the paper according to common practice?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |  | N/A |

## C.9 Is the paper well-structured and written according to the guidelines?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all | Weakly | Adequately | Well | Very well |  | N/A |

Comments about technical issues of the paper:

# D. Decisive questions

## D.1 What is the contribution of the paper to new knowledge

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| None | Weak | Good | Strong |

## D.2 Overall rating:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly reject | Possible reject | Neutral | Possibly accept | Definitely accept |

**Definitely accept:** I would argue strongly for accepting this submission.  
**Possibly accept:** I would argue for accepting this submission.  
**Neutral:** Overall I would not argue for accepting or rejecting this submission.  
**Possible reject:** I would argue for rejecting this submission.  
**Strongly reject:** I would argue strongly for rejecting this submission.

## D.3 Is the paper suitable for publishing in the conference proceedings?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Yes, with *major* revisions | Yes, with *minor* revisions | Yes, in *present* form |

Comments and motivation for decision made on the paper:  
(If revision is needed, give details on changes needed for acceptance, refer to previous comments if possible)

## D.4 Additional comments, remarks, and suggestions (visible to the author)

# E. Additional comments (*not* visible to the author)

(Please split the document upon submission and submit the information on this page as a separate document)

## E.1 Confidential notes to the editors (*not* visible to the author)

## E.2 Would you recommend this paper for the Best Paper Award?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |

If Yes, give a motivation for why this paper should be considered for the best paper award:

Thank you for your review!

Please post the review as soon as possible according to the instructions.