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The review process calls for reviewer summary recommendation and open narrative comment.

**I.** **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:** *Please select one*

\_\_\_\_\_ Accept: no revision needed

\_\_\_\_\_ Accept: minor revision needed

\_\_\_\_\_ Major revisions needed: suggest revision and resubmission; this might involve a second round of reviews

\_\_\_\_\_ Reject

If the authors revise as you suggest, would you be willing to review the revision?

\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_No

If article should be sent to a different journal, which one(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Note: If recommending rejection, provide detailed reasons in the comments section for both the editor and the author (ASJP) . For acceptance or revision, offer specific guidance to improve the manuscript using the sections below.**

**II. NARRATIVE ASSESSMENT:**

*Provide a detailed assessment directed to the author(s), highlighting the manuscript’s strengths and weaknesses. Clearly identify unresolved issues and offer actionable suggestions for improvement. Consider the following criteria in your evaluation:*

1. **Originality and Contribution:**

**Does the manuscript offer new findings, concepts, or theories? Alternatively, is it a fresh interpretation of an existing area of inquiry?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Significance of Research Problem:**

**How important is the research problem? Is the purpose well-defined?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Theoretical Frameworks and Literature Review:**

**Are the frameworks and literature reviews well-developed and appropriate? Has the author engaged with the relevant scholarship and used key sources effectively?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Methodological Soundness:**

**Are the methods appropriate and rigorously applied to address the research problem?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Inferences and Conclusions:**

**Are the conclusions well-supported and convincing? Are the theoretical and practical implications clearly articulated?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Organisation and Readability:**

**Is the manuscript well-structured, coherent, and readable? Does it present a clear and logical argument? Is the writing style suitable for the purpose?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Target Readership:**

**Who is the intended audience? Is the article aimed at a highly specialised readership or a broader interdisciplinary audience?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Comments to the Author: Provide additional comments, including specific suggestions for improvement or areas requiring clarification.**