

[Welcome](#) > [Reviewer](#)

[Need help?](#)

#	Action	Submission_ID	Title	Review Stage	Requested	Due Date	Submitted
1	Complete the evaluation form	IJIL-132774	Influences of Digital...	Round 1	01 Dec 2022	10 Jan 2023	-
2	Submitted	IJIL-123781	Data Envelopment...	Round 1	03 Sep 2022	13 Oct 2022	23 Sep 2022
3	Submitted	IJIL-111981	Problem-Based...	Round 1	04 Aug 2022	13 Sep 2022	18 Aug 2022
4	Submitted	IJIL-114609	Study on e-Book...	Round 1	11 Jul 2022	20 Aug 2022	07 Aug 2022
5	Submitted	IJIL-112979	Principal's Academic...	Round 1	15 May 2022	24 Jun 2022	20 Jun 2022
6	Submitted	IJIL-101860	The Innovation of...	Round 1	18 Dec 2021	27 Jan 2022	25 Jan 2022
7	Submitted	IJIL-98866	Online Education in...	Round 1	02 Dec 2021	11 Jan 2022	06 Jan 2022
8	Submitted	IJIL-93395	The influence of...	Round 1	23 Sep 2021	02 Nov 2021	03 Nov 2021
9	Submitted	IJIL-87326	Performance evaluation...	Round 1	05 Aug 2021	14 Sep 2021	14 Sep 2021

Articles: 1 - 9 of 9

Guide for Reviewers

After receiving your 'invitation to review' email, you should:

1. Determine whether you can complete the review by the due date (usually 2 to 3 weeks).
2. Quickly skim the relevant portions of the article and verify that it fits within the scope of the journal and your area of expertise.
3. Accept or decline to do the review, using the relevant link above.

After accepting to review

Read the article in depth and use our online evaluation form to submit your thoughts and comments.

If you feel on reflection that the article does not fit within the scope of the journal, please contact the editor for instructions – use the 'Send a comment to Editor' feature which is located at the bottom of the evaluation form (click 'Complete the evaluation form' to get to the form).

If you have a time problem or a conflict of interest, please contact the editor for instructions. They may extend the deadline or reassign the review.

Please do not discuss the article with its authors either during or after the review process. Although it may seem reasonable to discuss points of difficulty or disagreement directly with an author, especially if you are generally in favour of publication and do not mind revealing your identity, this practice is prohibited. The other reviewers and the editor may have different opinions, and the author may be misled by having such a dialogue with you.

This article is a privileged communication. Please do not show it to anyone or discuss it, except to solicit assistance with a technical point. If you feel a colleague is more qualified than you to review the article, do not pass the article on to that person –contact the editor and explain the situation.

Your review and your recommendation should also be considered confidential.

In your comments intended for the author, do not make statements about the acceptability of an article; suggested revisions should be stated as such and not expressed as conditions of acceptance.

The final decision regarding modification, acceptance, or rejection of an article rests solely with the editor, so do not state your recommendation in the portion of the review that will be sent to the author.

The evaluation form contains comments boxes; please use these to give your overall impression of the article, and to highlight any major shortcomings. Criticism should be presented dispassionately; offensive remarks are not acceptable.

There is a comments box you can use to send confidential remarks to the editor.

You may be asked to review a revised version of the article, after the author has made any requested amendments. You will need to evaluate the author's responses to your original criticisms.

Your evaluation will play a major role in the editor's decision as to whether to accept an article for publication. It is important to be prompt, fair, and to review the article carefully and in depth.

Inderscience are very grateful for the time and effort you invest in this review process.

[Welcome](#) > [Reviewer](#) > [Evaluation form](#)

Article details

Title: Data Envelopment Analysis for identifying the most suitable cassava cultivar: A case study of various cultivated area in Thailand

Journal: Int. J. of Innovation and Learning

Editor: Kongkiti Phusavat

Original Submission: [2022_IJIL-123781.pdf](#) [02 Sep 2022]

Supplementary files: [2022_IJIL-123781_sup43278.eps](#) [16 Nov 2022]
[2022_IJIL-123781_sup43279.png](#) [16 Nov 2022]

Author's Revised Article: [2022_IJIL-123781_ARV.pdf](#) [08 Oct 2022]

Article Evaluation Form: Round 1

Submitted: 23 Sep 2022

MANUSCRIPT FEATURES

Reviewer Replies

Originality of the work	Good
Subject relevance	Good
Professional/industrial relevance	Good
Completeness of the work	Good
Acknowledgement of the work of others by references	Acceptable
Organisation of the manuscript	Good
Clarity in writing tables graphs and illustrations	Good
Likelihood of passing the test of time	Good

QUALITY AND RIGOUR

Have you checked the equations and/or statistics? (if applicable)	Yes
Are you aware of prior publication or presentation of this work?	No
Is the manuscript free of commercialism?	Yes
Is the article too long?	No

RECOMMENDATION

Acceptable with major revisions

COMMENTS

Changes which must be made before publication:-

Please kindly emphasize the importance of this study

In results and discussion, authors should relate the findings to theories and compare to findings of previous works.

Authors should justify the global applicability of the model

Suggestions which would improve the quality of the article but are not essential for publication:-

na

Confidential comments only for the editor:-

na

[Send comment to Editor](#)

[Show comment](#)