**Guideline for Reviewers**

Thank you for accepting to be a reviewer for reviewing a manuscript submitted to JIL. These instructions will ensure we have everything required so your review process smoothly. Please take the time to read and follow them as closely as possible, as doing so will ensure your paper matches the JIL journal's requirements. Complete guidelines for preparing and submitting your review results for JIL are provided below.

**Peer Review Guidelines**

 Before you accept or decline an invitation to review, please consider the following:

* The article suits your area of expertise and you can conduct an insightful and precise review of it.
* There is no conflict of interest between you and the author(s). If so, report it to the editor immediately.
* Before you accept the invitation, make certain that you can complete the review within the assigned deadline. If there are unexpected circumstances that hinder your progress towards the deadline, report them to the editors immediately, so they can inform the author(s) of the possible delay.
* Whether you decide to accept or decline the invitation, please respond to it at your earliest convenience.
* It is also important to note that the information about the review must not be shared with anyone without permission from the editors and the author(s).

**Step by step guide to reviewing a manuscript**

* The review process can be conducted through Open Journal Systems of JIL.
* Reviewer’s duty is to consider a manuscript before publication, providing suggestions for the author’s corrections and giving advice that helps improve its content quality.
* Author should use a standard writing format and appropriate academic tone and style that suit the content of the manuscript without plagiarism. It is important to note that JIL strictly follows a set of guidelines and recommendations published by Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).
* The manuscript must derive from the research project initiated by the author and contain a link between the discussion of research findings, objectives and the literature review that are beneficial for academic circles.
* Reviewer should provide suggestions and corrections for the improvement of the manuscript quality concerning the key components including tile, abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, discussion of the findings, language use and citation.
* Reviewer should provide the author with suggestions and comments on an appropriate use of data tables, figures, charts and diagrams.
* Reviewer should provide the author with a list of other suggestions necessary for a further improvement of the manuscript, which also facilitate the subsequent checking and correction process.

**Evaluation criteria**

Reviewers for JIL should evaluate all manuscripts against this criteria:

**1. Scholarship (scientific and scholarly rigor)**

**2. Pedagogy (educational relevance, insight)**

**3. Utility (usefulness to JIL readers, rationale)**

**4. Presentation (organization, comprehensiveness, readability)**

**5. Originality (novelty, innovation, creativity)**

Reviewer reports should be written to address each indicator in turn, providing a general overview of how the manuscript meets or does not meet the indicators, followed by any specific comments identifying relevant questions or concerns about the text.

The quality of the manuscript will be evaluated into four levels:

**Meets Highest Standards**

**Acceptable**

**Needs Improvement**

**Unacceptable**

In addition, the reviewer is requested to estimate the value of the work. If articles were published in order of value to readers, when should this one appear? (Assume no impact on the authors.)

**Immediately (ahead of others already in the queue)**

**High but not top priority**

**As space becomes available (okay to put others ahead of it)**

**Never**

**Rejection before review**

All manuscripts submitted to JIL are subject to pre-screening for conformity to journal policy regarding submissions (as outlined in these author guidelines) and to establish that the manuscript meets the three primary indicators on which submitted manuscripts are judged.

When submitting manuscripts to JIL, authors are asked to address the following questions about their manuscript:

1. What is learning innovation you are addressing?

2. What is/are the key finding(s) or contributions of such learning innovation?

3. Why is the learning innovation important and timely? (That the research has not been done before is not on its own sufficient justification for novelty.)

4. What are the three most recently published papers that are relevant to this manuscript?

Answers to these questions and the manuscript abstract may be used to judge, with respect to the primary indicators, whether manuscripts are sent to Editors-in-Chief (EIC). As a result of this pre-screening, manuscripts may be rejected before review. The pre-screening will be done firstly by the Editors-in-Chief (EIC) to reduce workload on reviewers. Furthermore, whilst we understand the challenge for many non-fluent English speakers, we require that the manuscript’s grammar and syntax is of sufficient quality before it is sent to reviewers.

**The review process**

Manuscripts that are sent out to review are considered by a minimum of three independent reviewers who we do not believe, to the best of our knowledge, have any serious conflicts of interest between themselves and the authors. This choice of reviewers will reflect: (1) the topic of the manuscript; (2) the methods that have been used; (3) the published work that has been referred to in the manuscript; (4) a potential reviewer’s track record of reviewing for the journal, unless they are a new reviewer; and (5) who we have asked to review recently. We may or may not use reviewers nominated by an author. Reviewers are expected to return their reviews within 14 days of agreeing to review.

Authors should be aware that the time taken to identify willing reviewers, delays in the return of reviews by reviewers and the time required for the EIC to make recommendations and to reach a decision add to the time that it takes to get a first decision to authors.

**The Recommendation and Decision-Making Process**

The reviewers provide us with an evaluation of a manuscript’s technical quality, scientific originality and significance, and presentation quality. Reviewers don’t make decisions. Rather, the reviewers’ reports and manuscript are considered by the Editors-in-Chief. The Editors-in-Chief consider the manuscript, reviewers’ reports and Associate Editor’s recommendation and make a decision.

**Possible Decisions**

 The review process can lead to one of the following review decisions.

* **Reject**

There are in essence three types of manuscript that receive this recommendation, those that have: (i) an interesting idea but lack the supporting data and additional data need to be collected before the manuscript is likely to sustain the idea; (ii) interesting data, but the context for the work and the interpretation of the data are some way from being worthy of further consideration even with a major revision; and (iii) poor presentation. Where a revised manuscript has been considered by reviewers for a second time and the manuscript is found to require major revision, the manuscript may be rejected and the authors encouraged to submit a new manuscript. After review, the manuscript may be rejected if the manuscript is found to have little originality or significance and/or has serious flaws in relation to method and to data that mean that these would be difficult to address, or have not been adequately addressed in resubmission.

* **Major Revision**

The manuscript falls short in some way in relation to its rigour, its originality or its potential significance, and/or presentation quality requiring significant additional work. This could be a substantial addition of literature, the re-analysis of data, changes to the representation or interpretation of data, modification of the discussion, a rethink of the conclusions, or editing is required for syntax and grammar. A manuscripts receiving a major revision result must be subjected to a second review. Where possible, the same reviewers will be used to accomplish the second review to ensure consistency between the initial review and the second review. Normally, manuscripts that receive a major revision decision should upload the revised version to the JIL Open Journal Systems within 90 days. If the author(s) failed to make satisfactory changes in the manuscript, the manuscript is rejected.

* **Minor Revision**

The manuscript falls short in some way in relation to its rigour, its originality or its potential significance, and/or presentation quality requiring significant additional work. This could be a minor revision of introduction, literature, interpretation of data, modification of the discussion, a rethink of the conclusions, or editing is required for syntax and grammar. A revised manuscript will be evaluated by the editor against the reviewers’ comments. Normally, manuscripts that receive a minor revision decision should upload the revised version to the JIL Open Journal Systems within 30 days. If the author(s) failed to make satisfactory changes in the manuscript, the manuscript is rejected.

* **Accept**

the manuscript does not need any further revision, even minor typographical changes and the manuscript is ready to be passed to production.

**Revised manuscripts**

Revised manuscripts are handled according to consideration of: (a) the first decision made; and (b) the thoroughness of the author response. Where responses are felt to be insufficient, a revised manuscript may be returned to the authors without review with the same decision as was made before; may be sent for external review; or may be rejected. Authors are therefore strongly encouraged to respond to reviewers constructively by making the changes requested, and by providing a full account of the revisions undertaken. Some review comments may be rebutted provided a full justification is provided but even where a rebuttal is appropriate, there may still be matters of modification required to address the concerns raised by the reviewer.

**Queries**

Should you have any queries, please contact us via these e-mails: editor\_jil@mahidol.ac.th, assist\_jil@mahidol.ac.th