

Manuscript Review Form



Gyanmanjari International E- Journal of Engineering, Pharmacy & Science Research (GMIJ-EPSR)

An International Publication of Gyanmanjari Innovative University (GMIU)

I. Submission Details

- **Manuscript Title:**

- **Manuscript No:**

- **Reviewer Name:**

- **Date Sent:**

- **Date Due:**

II. Evaluation Criteria

Please rate the following sections on a scale of 1 (Excellent) to 5 (Poor) or using the categorical scales provided.

A. Topic and Rationale

- **Relevance:** Is the topic relevant to the journal, contemporary, and timely?
- **Grounding:** Is the rationale based on known theory or an interesting, well-grounded issue?

Rating:
 1 2 3 4 5

- **Written Comment:**

B. Abstract and Goals

- **Components:** Are all required components included and keywords appropriately chosen?
- **Clarity of Goal:** Is the goal explicitly and unambiguously stated in the introduction?

Rating:
 1 2 3 4 5

Written Comment:

C. Rigor and Methodology

- **Research Rigor:** Is the article based on rigorous academic standards?
- **Appropriateness:** Is the analytical method appropriate for the study and applied properly?
- **Validity:** If a survey, is there strong evidence of reliability and validity of constructs?

Rating:
 1 **2** **3** **4** **5**

Written Comment:

D. Presentation and Style

- **Clarity:** Is the paper well-organized, coherent, and clearly written?
- **Accessibility:** Is the format accessible to practitioners (readable style, technical material in appendices)?
- **Figures/Tables:** Are legends and notations clear and used suitably?

Rating:
 1 **2** **3** **4** **5**

Written Comment:

E. Contribution and Literature

- **Significance:** Does it break new ground or provide a foundation for future research?
- **Knowledge Base:** Does the author utilize all recent and relevant contributions to the field?

Rating:
 1 **2** **3** **4** **5**

- **Written Comment:**

III. Results and Discussion

- **Data Analysis:** Is the discussion based on data analysis without overstating results?
- **Coherence:** Is the conclusion related and coherent with the results presented?
- **Written Comment:**

IV. Final Recommendation

Select one of the following:

- **Accept / Publish Immediately:** Suitable to be published as is.
- **Accept with Minor Revision:** Suitable after corrections.
- **Reconsider after Major Revision:** Promising, but needs significant work.
- **Reject:** Not suitable for publishing.

Priority:

- High Priority
- No Rush

V. Reviewer Remarks

- **Confidential Remarks to Editor:**

- **Comments for the Author:**

VI. Signature:

Reviewer Name

Signature

Date
