

Peer Review Report Guideline for Research Proposals

Criteria	Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
Proposal title	The title gains the readers' interest, describes the session	The title clearly describes the session	The title has some indication of the session's content	The title gives little information about the session's content
Introduction (Problem significance and purpose of the study)	The introduction is engaging, states the problem, provides a context for the study and previews the project's structure.	The introduction states the problem, provides a context for the study and previews the structure of the innovative Project	The introduction states problem, but does not provide a context for the study	No clear introduction, or problem statement or structure of the Innovative Project
Literature Review	Comprehensive review of the current, relevant literature to both the problem statement and the proposed innovation is presented using updated references.	Study is connected to the existing research, and use of mostly relevant and recent literature related to the problem statement and proposed innovation	Makes an attempt to connect the study to existing research, however multiple sources cited do not relate to the problem or proposed innovation.	Little or no attempt to conduct the study to existing research.
Aim	Project idea is novel with Clear focus and meaningful impact on the literature, and an extremely comprehensive explanation of the problem.	There is a clear focus, and a developed explanation of the problem, a connection to student learning has been made and a reasonable response is proposed.	The area of focus is too broad or narrow. Does not clearly make a strong connection to student learning or the proposed response is not clearly linked to the problem.	There is no clear focus for the project. No case has been made that a problem exists. No connection to student learning is evident. An underdeveloped response is proposed.

Objectives		The objectives are well defined, appropriate, and achievable. States a specific testable research question	The objectives are appropriate, but untestable research question	The objectives may be too general. States a vague, untestable research question	The objectives are poorly Objectives are defined. No research question posed
Methodology	Study design	The purpose, questions, and design are mutually supportive and coherent. Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated.	The research design has been identified and described.	The introduction states problem, but does not provide a context for the study	No clear introduction, or problem statement or structure of the Innovative Project
	Data Collection Tool	Comprehensive review of the current, relevant literature to both the problem statement and the proposed innovation is presented using updated references.	Study is connected to the existing research, and use of mostly relevant and recent literature related to the problem statement and proposed innovation	Makes an attempt to connect the study to existing research, however multiple sources cited do not relate to the problem or proposed innovation.	Little or no attempt to conduct the study to existing research.
	Population	Project idea is novel with Clear focus and meaningful impact on the literature, and an extremely comprehensive explanation of the problem.	There is a clear focus, and a developed explanation of the problem, a connection to student learning has been made and a reasonable response is proposed.	The area of focus is too broad or narrow. Does not clearly make a strong connection to student learning or the proposed response is not clearly linked to the problem.	There is no clear focus for the project. No case has been made that a problem exists. No connection to student learning is evident. An underdeveloped response is proposed.
	Sampling technique	the sampling process and technique a described are reasonable to recruit a representative sample	Sampling strategy and size were identified and described.	Population and sampling strategy and techniques were not well identified and clear.	Sampling strategy is not identified or inappropriate for the research question
	Data analysis	Methods for analysis were adequately specific and appropriate considering the research question, study design and the scale of measurement.	Both of descriptive and inferential methods of analysis are clearly identified.	The descriptive or inferential methods of analysis were not clear or lack relevance to the research type.	Both or one of the analytical methods were not identified or inappropriately aligned with the data and the research question.
Project Timeline		A clear and concise project timetable is provided. The schedule of activities is logical and feasible in relation to the project goals, objectives, and budget.	Logical timetable is provided for each of the project tasks.	A partial description of scheduled activities is provided Project feasibility is uncertain.	No project timetable is provided. Reviewers are unable to ascertain scheduled activities or project feasibility

Itemized Budget	The budget is clear, reasonable, follows the budget guidelines, provides detailed explanations for the amount requested, and reflects efforts to minimize costs.	The budget is clear, reasonable, follows the budget guidelines, and provides explanations for the amount requested.	The budget is reasonable and follows some of the budget guidelines, but lacks clarity or explanations for the amount requested and reconsideration of some parts.	The budget is not organized, is not reasonable, and does not specify the items to be covered through the grant.
Ethical consideration	The consent procedure is fully explained and fits the research study, confidentiality for all participants is protected at all times, and collected research data is well preserved with limited access to the research team. Authorship of participants' materials adequately anticipated for participants for acknowledgment and publication.	Consent procedure is mentioned, participants confidentiality is protected, research data is located safely were access is limited to research team only, authorship and acknowledgment is anticipated for all participants.	Consent procedure is not clearly mentioned, partial description of data storage and confidentiality is mentioned, authorship and acknowledgment is anticipated for some participants.	Consent procedure needs clarification, data storage and access limitation is not discussed, and authorship and acknowledgment of participants is not discussed.
Potential for publication in high IF journals 1	There is a good potential for publication in top %5 of Q1 journals	There is a high potential for publication in Q1 journals	There is potential for publication in Q2 journals	Resulted publication has potential for acceptance in Q3 journals
Quality of writing	Professional written considering language guidelines and citation.	Writing conformed to the standards of language guidelines.	Writing is weak with inconsistency of application to the Guidelines, organization and language composition.	Writing failed to fulfill standard rules of writing and language composition.
Total Score				
Reviewer Recommendation	Proposal highly recommended	Proposal recommended with implementation of reviewer comment.	Writing is weak with inconsistency of application to the Guidelines, organization and language composition.	Proposal is conditionally recommended upon implementation of reviewer comments.

1 please refer to www.scimago.com for journal details including ranking and its area.