



Imron Rosidi <imronrosidi@gmail.com>

Fwd: [peuradeun] Editor Decision

1 message

Masduki Masduki <masduki@uin-suska.ac.id>
To: Imron Rosidi <imronrosidi@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 10, 2021 at 7:38 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

Dari: **Masduki Masduki** <masduki@uin-suska.ac.id>
Date: Min, 5 Des 2021 4:14 PM
Subject: Fwd: [peuradeun] Editor Decision
To: Dony Arung <arungdony73@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

Dari: **Tabrani ZA** <tabraniza@scadindependent.org>
Date: Sab, 4 Des 2021 1:22 PM
Subject: [peuradeun] Editor Decision
To: Masduki Masduki <masduki@uin-suska.ac.id>**Article ID: 624***Dear Masduki Masduki (Author):*Thank you for submitting your paper to **Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun**.

It is a very interesting topic. Although we appreciate the work you have put into the paper, we have determined that your paper needs several developments in order to be considered for publication in the Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun. There are several points of view that should be considered in particular which may construct the paper.

After Editorial Board and Reviewers inspect and review your manuscript, we have reached a decision regarding your submission about "**The "Teras Dakwah" (Dakwah Terrace) Movement Program: The Philosophy and Dakwah Activism Charity-Based in Yogyakarta**".**Our decision is: Revisions Required**

We have received comments and decisions from reviewers for your manuscript. Your manuscript should be pending publication due to some minor revisions which may construct your manuscript. Attached are the overall comments of the peer reviewer about your manuscript (Please see editor and reviewer notes in the attached file).

Please revise your manuscript. **The Deadline for revision and re-submit of the manuscript is within two weeks from the date of the notice.** And then, please make a **Table of Corrections** to make it easier for editors to assess your revised manuscript. **The Table of Corrections contains the reviewer's comments, your revision, and the page.** You can see the **Table of Correction** format on the journal's website, in the author's guidelines section. The Table of Corrections is sent with your revised manuscript as a separate file. Please make sure the revision that you submitted has been in the JIP Template and has followed the **JIP author's guidelines**. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you for your contribution and cooperation.

*Best Regards,*Tabrani ZA
SCAD Independent Research Institute, Indonesia
tabraniza@scadindependent.org-----
Reviewer A:

1. Are the title, abstract and keywords appropriately reflect the content of the paper?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

Yes

2. Are the aims, objectives, novelty and the significance of the study are clear? And is the main issues discussed in this paper very important and in accordance with the novelty?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

Yes

3. Is the paper sufficiently broadly and critically review the relevant scientific literature on the topic?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

Yes

4. Is the research methodology or approach to problem-solving that used was relevant, detail and clear?**5. Is the research findings clearly and comprehensibly presented? And did the authors conducted data presentation and interpretation were valid and reasonable?**

Yes

6. Is the discussion relevant to the research findings? and is the author(s) clearly express and explain their own professional viewpoints?

Yes

7. Are the conclusions are clearly and comprehensively? Especially in terms of the author's critical evaluation of research findings.

Yes

8. Are the references used relevant and up to date? and does it match the citations in the article?

Yes

9. Are there other existing papers related to this paper?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

Yes

10. Are the papers quality, structure, and grammar excellent and perfectly crafted?

Good

Are there any parts of the manuscripts that should be reduced or omitted? Please give your suggestions or some points of view to which may construct, including the strengths/ weaknesses of this paper.

Your introduction is too long. Please focus more on the problem you want to study. also define the problem gap clearly. The abstract must be synthesis from the content. Please pay more attention to the coverage of an abstract. Abstract between 150-200 words. Five points in the abstract must be present,

please review the journal template. The research design must be clear. In addition, we noticed that your methods are lacking detail on how exactly the study was performed. Please bear in mind that readers must be able to recreate your study from the level of detail that you give. For instance, for qualitative studies involving interviews and focus groups. The conclusion needs to discuss comprehensively. That section needs to synthesis comprehensively, especially in terms of the author's critical evaluation of research findings, must explain your contribution to knowledge. Correspondence of conclusions with results is highly recommended. Need more current references that dis cuss a similar topic thus makes the research well supported. Please add references up to date! You need additional references from international journals, and then we recommend that you quote several related articles from this journal. You need to improve the structure and grammar. Extensive editing should be undertaken, since some errors in some parts of sentences in order to make sure zero errors. Please adjust the overall writing of references using APA Style 7th Edition. If you are using APA style, the in-text citations must use APA style. For citations and references, it is mandatory to Use the Mendeley App.

 Reviewer B:

1. Are the title, abstract and keywords appropriately reflect the content of the paper?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

2. Are the aims, objectives, novelty and the significance of the study are clear? And is the main issues discussed in this paper very important and in accordance with the novelty?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

3. Is the paper sufficiently broadly and critically review the relevant scientific literature on the topic?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

4. Is the research methodology or approach to problem-solving that used was relevant, detail and clear?

5. Is the research findings clearly and comprehensibly presented? And did the authors conducted data presentation and interpretation were valid and reasonable?

6. Is the discussion relevant to the research findings? and is the author(s) clearly express and explain their own professional viewpoints?

7. Are the conclusions are clearly and comprehensively? Especially in terms of the author's critical evaluation of research findings.

8. Are the references used relevant and up to date? and does it match the citations in the article?

9. Are there other existing papers related to this paper?

Please provide your comments in detail in the comments section (if any).

10. Are the papers quality, structure, and grammar excellent and perfectly crafted?

Are there any parts of the manuscripts that should be reduced or omitted? Please give your suggestions or some points of view to which may construct, including the strengths/ weaknesses of this paper.

Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun

St. Tgk. Pulo Dibarah, No. 26, Kp. Baru, Baiturrahman Sub-district, Banda Aceh City 23242, Aceh, Indonesia.
 Official E-mail: info.jip@scadIndependent.org | website: www.journal.scadIndependent.org

Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun, Your Intellectual Nutrition...

2 attachments



A-624-99Z_Article Text-2769-1-4-20210521.doc
2625K



B-Reviewer Comment Paper ID 624.pdf
423K