Ethiopian Sport Academy
Ethiopian Journal of Sport Science
Evaluation of Manuscripts

The evaluation of a manuscript for publication in X journal follows a rigorous process. To do so, a five-point rating scale is used for scoring each of the quality indicators. In general, a rating of 3 or above is considered acceptable, while ratings of 1 or 2 do not achieve minimal standards for passing.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING A MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION

Below is the guideline for scoring and interpreting results and the corresponding proposed action when this instrument used in evaluating manuscript for publication.

Manuscript Code _____ Researcher Code_____

Name:_____ Date: _____

I. Rating: For each category, please indicate your evaluation by marking an "X" in the appropriate box (PR–Poor (1), FR – Fair (2), GD – GOOD (3), VG – Very Good (4) Excellent (5). Please include comments

No	Evaluation Category	PR 1	FR 2	GD 3	VG 4	Ex 5
1	The submission adds to the body of knowledge in the field and will provokethought among Journal readers. Comments:_____ _____					
2	The study is relevant to the mission of the journal or its audience. Comments:_____ _____					
3	The introduction builds a logical case and provides context for the problem statement. Comments:_____ _____					
4	The problem/idea proposed is clear andconcise. Comments:_____ _____					
5	The author addresses the relevant literature in the field adequately. Comments:_____ _____					
6	The discussion is sufficiently developed andrelevant.					

	_____ _____ _____					
7	The research methods are appropriate forthe study and are clearly described. Comments:_____ _____					
8	The design is appropriate for the research purpose or question. If a mixed-methods approach is used, the rationale is provided for the relationship between and sequencing of quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study. Comments:_____ _____					
9	Has the study undergone ethics review? _____ _____					
10	Are there any gender or age issues that need to be addressed? orIs the inclusion or exclusion of particular study groups justified?					
11	. Is a sample size provided, along with the assumptions on which it is based? Is the sample size adequate? _____ _____					
12	Correct statistical procedures are used andare appropriate for the study's research paradigm. Comments:_____ _____					
13	Overall, the author's communication of their analysis is clear and evidences a general, overarching understanding of the issues involved in this question. Comments:_____ _____					
14	The findings/ideas are presented concisely and adequately (tables, figures, etc.). Comments:_____ _____					
15	Results & discussion are accurately stated based on the data. Thoughtful, detailed and comprehensive discussion is presented. Key findings are specifically related to previous research. Comments:_____ _____					
16	The author provides an insightful analysis of the data in the					

	article, answering all or nearly all ofthe research questions framed by the author/s. The analysis is clear and relevant for the purpose intended. Comments:_____ _____					
17	The author's conclusions and/or recommendations are justified by the perspectives and evidences presented and are linked to the introduction and/or review of literature. Comments:_____ _____					
18	The manuscript is written clearly, following English grammar rules, and accurate spelling use. Comments:_____ _____					
19	The originality of the flow, concepts and conclusions made?					
20	Does the study enhance the institution's research infrastructure/support systems or the sector at overall level?					

Total _____100

II. Recommendation: Please select ONE category; include your comments explaining your selection

Overall Evaluation	**Marks Obtained**	**Reviewer Rating**	**Proposed Action**
Definitely Accepted For Publication	***≥85***	Excellent	Accepted
Publication AfterMINOR Revisions	***75≥ x<85***	**V. Good**	Accepted with Mainor modification
Requires Substantial Revisions Before It Can Be Considered	***50≥ x<65***	Good	Accepted with major modification
Probably Accepted For	***40≥ x<50***	Very poor	Proceed to the next stage
Not Acceptable For Publication/Plagiarism /Already Published	***<40***	Poor	Rejected

Name of the Evaluator: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____