

**International Graduate Studies Human Resource Development**

Queen Sirikit Building 1, Faculty of Education, Burapha University,
169 Longhard Bangsaen Saensook , Muang, Chonburi,Thailand
Tel. 0-3810-2004, 0-3810-2046 Fax. 0-3839-3498

HRD JOURNAL GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPT REVIEWERS

PART 1: GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPT REVIEWERS

Your contribution as a reviewer is very important to both the Editorial Team and the author(s). You can help by ensuring that you provide feedback to us on all four points specified in this form. Please keep in mind that authors have devoted considerable effort to preparing their submissions, and this should be acknowledged in the quality of feedback we provide them.

Manuscript review checklist

All manuscripts submitted to the HRD journal will have strengths and weaknesses. Very often referees focus their feedback solely on the weaknesses. We would like to ensure that they and the authors receive a balanced view of the overall strengths and weaknesses of each manuscript. So, in addition to detailed written feedback comments for the author(s), we should also like you to complete the checklist provided in the manuscript review part of this form.

Your detailed qualitative feedback on content of the manuscript

Please provide your written comments on the paper in the space provided. If more space is required, please use a separate sheet of paper to continue your comments and attach it to this form. This is particularly important for the author. Your comments should be constructive, specific, and offer clear guidance for improvement. Please avoid making general comments. Your role is not only to identify problems, but also to mention the strengths. It is very important that you provide suggestions how to make the manuscript more acceptable.

Rating and recommendation

Please provide your overall rating and recommendation on the manuscript's overall rating and recommendation part of this form.

MANUSCRIPT ASSESSMENT FORM

MANUSCRIPT NO.

TYPE OF PAPER: Qualitative research paper

TITLE OF PAPER :

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Quality level key: 4 = Excellent, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, 1 = Unsatisfactory

Assessment Criteria	Quality Level				Remarks
	4	3	2	1	
The Quality of Writing 1. Quality of the writing: presents ideas clearly and in a logical and orderly manner.					
2. Is objective and professional in the treatment of the subject matter, tells an integrated and consistent story					
Contribution to the body of knowledge in the field 3. Theoretical contribution: is theoretically important; justifies claims to importance; can take the field into new directions of research					
4. Practical contribution: is of practical importance; links theory and practice					
5. Appropriateness: Is appropriate to the HRD journal; is a new, emerging, or under researched area; is timely in terms of current trends; is provocative and provides new insights					
Problem Statement 6. Presenting the research problem, the background, the problem needed to be investigated, provides an explanatory statement indicating the purpose of the study.					
7. The research problem, the purpose of the study and research questions congruence with the research topic					

Assessment Criteria	Quality Level				Remarks
	4	3	2	1	
<p>Literature Review</p> <p>8. Relevance and scope of the literature review: appropriate body of literature clearly identified; literature review is up to date; literature is fully discussed; reaches logical.</p>					
<p>The Research Design and Methodological Rigor</p> <p>9. Appropriateness: uses appropriate design for the research problem; justifies use of methodology based upon research problem and questions, provides the limitations of the research results.</p>					
<p>10. Trustworthiness: provide evidence to justify the validity of the data, uses qualitative techniques accurately; addresses issues relating to analyzing qualitative data; describes all procedures clearly.</p>					
<p>11. Ethical consideration: report how the researcher deal with the ethical issues in the study.</p>					
<p>Results and Conclusions</p> <p>12. Appropriateness of results: links research questions and data analysis; does not over interpret or under interpret results and conclusions.</p>					
<p>13. Appropriateness of the conclusions: links results to conclusions; does not go beyond results in the conclusions; derives theoretical implications from the results; derives practical implications from the results; places results within a broader context; considers both limitations and constraints in the study; does not overlook results that contradict or suggest alternative explanations.</p>					
Total					

DETAILED QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

OVERALL RATING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall Rating: Excellent Good Fair Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory rating: paper may be rejected or a new version may be submitted for reconsideration

Fair rating: paper may be accepted for presentation subject to a major revision

Good rating: paper may be accepted for presentation with a minor revision

Excellent rating: paper may be accepted for presentation without revision or with a very minor revision

Recommendations:

Acceptable: In present form With minor revision With major revision

Unacceptable: A new version may be submitted

NAME OF REVIEWER:

DATE: