

Review Guidelines

Your primary goal is to help authors enhance the current manuscript and improve future submissions. Aim to provide constructive feedback rather than discouraging authors, irrespective of your recommendation for acceptance or rejection. Maintain a professional and constructive tone in your feedback, avoiding overly negative wording or personal comments.

Identify the manuscript's major strengths and weaknesses, offering specific suggestions for addressing identified problems. Your report should be comprehensive and readable by both the editor and the author. Begin with a brief summary of the manuscript after the initial reading. Provide a numbered list addressing Major Aspects and Minor Aspects. Discuss major problems first, encompassing issues with the study's method or analysis. Proceed to address minor problems, such as challenging-to-read tables or figures, unclear sections, and suggestions for text removal.

If you find the English language of the manuscript inappropriate for publication, provide specific examples. This ensures authors understand the issues and how to address them. Be as specific as possible about the manuscript's weaknesses, explaining how authors can address them. If the manuscript has line numbers, include page and line numbers relevant to the discussed part of the study.

Reread your commentary to ensure clarity and simplicity in language. Consider that authors and the editor may not be native English speakers. Your feedback plays a crucial role in the improvement of manuscripts and contributes to the overall quality of the conference.

Manuscript Title

> Please enter the title here <

Summary

> Briefly summarize the literature review article, emphasizing its objectives, key findings, and potential contributions to the field. <

General Comments

> Provide an overall assessment of the review article, highlighting its main strengths and areas for improvement. <

Review Comments

In a numbered list, explain each aspect you found that needs to be fixed. Divide the list into two sections: Major Aspects and Minor Aspects. Write about the major problems first, including issues with the method or analysis of the study. Then address minor problems, such as tables or figures that are difficult to read, sections requiring further explanation, and suggestions for deleting unnecessary text. If the manuscript has line numbers, include the page and line number(s) that relate to the part of the study you are discussing. If you identify concerns with the English language, provide specific examples to guide the authors in addressing language-related issues.

Major Aspects

> 1. Please enter your first aspect here <

> 2. Please enter your second aspect here <

> ... <

Minor Aspects

> 1. Please enter your first aspect here <

> 2. Please enter your second aspect here <

> ... <

Evaluation Table – Advanced Manufacturing Students Conference

Language and Style (if appropriate)

> 1. Please enter your first aspect here <

> 2. Please enter your second aspect here <

> ... <

Evaluation Table

Category	Criteria	Scored	Total
Title and Abstract	Clarity of the title <i>Assess the degree to which the title effectively communicates the main focus of the literature review.</i>	0/2	0/10
	Relevance of the title <i>Evaluate how well the title aligns with the content of the article, ensuring it accurately represents the research.</i>	0/2	
	Conciseness of the abstract <i>Consider whether the abstract provides a brief yet comprehensive overview of the study without unnecessary details.</i>	0/2	
	Informativeness of the abstract <i>Evaluate the extent to which the abstract delivers essential information about the objectives, methods and results.</i>	0/2	
	Adherence to specified word length <i>Check whether the abstract complies with any specified word length or limitations.</i>	0/2	
Introduction	Clear statement of the research problem <i>Evaluate the clarity and precision with which the introduction communicates the specific research problem addressed in the literature review.</i>	0/2	0/10
	Adequate review of relevant literature <i>Assess the comprehensiveness (7 to 10 references) and relevance of the literature review, examining its ability to capture key studies and concepts.</i>	0/2	
	Presentation of the research objectives/questions <i>Evaluate the clarity and specificity of the stated research objectives or questions in guiding the literature review.</i>	0/2	
	Clear contextualization of the research problem <i>Assess how well the introduction contextualizes the research problem within the broader field of study, providing necessary background information.</i>	0/2	
	Clear justification of the significance and relevance of the research problem <i>Evaluate the introduction's ability to justify the importance of the research problem and its relevance to the field.</i>	0/2	
Methodology	Explanation of the search strategy <i>Assess the clarity and completeness of the explanation regarding the search strategy employed in the literature review.</i>	0/2	0/10
	Clarity of the used methodology <i>Evaluate how clearly the methodology is described, ensuring that readers can understand the approach taken.</i>	0/2	
	Structure of the used methodology <i>Consider the logical organization and presentation of the methodology, ensuring it is easy to follow.</i>	0/2	
	Transparency of the criteria used to include or exclude studies <i>Evaluate the transparency of the criteria used for the inclusion or exclusion of studies in the literature review.</i>	0/2	
	Appropriateness of the methodology for addressing the research questions <i>Assess whether the chosen methodology aligns with and effectively addresses the stated research questions.</i>	0/2	
Results	Clarity of results <i>Evaluate how clearly the results of the literature review are presented, ensuring ease of understanding.</i>	0/2	0/10
	Organization of results <i>Assess the logical structure and organization of the results section, ensuring a coherent flow.</i>	0/2	
	Effective textual description <i>Evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of textual descriptions accompanying the results.</i>	0/2	
	Avoidance of redundancy <i>Check whether the results are presented without unnecessary repetition, ensuring a focused presentation.</i>	0/2	
	Presentation of key findings/insights <i>Assess how effectively the key findings and insights from the literature review are presented and emphasized.</i>	0/2	

Evaluation Table – Advanced Manufacturing Students Conference

Category	Criteria	Scored	Total
Discussion	Interpretation of results <i>Evaluate the extent to which the results are interpreted and discussed within the broader context of the literature.</i>	0/2	0/15
	Contextualization of results <i>Assess how well the results are contextualized within the existing literature, demonstrating a deep understanding of the field.</i>	0/2	
	Comparison with existing literature <i>Evaluate the effectiveness of comparing the literature review findings with existing studies and identifying commonalities or differences.</i>	0/2	
	Implications of the findings for the field <i>Assess how well the discussion highlights the implications and potential impact of the literature review on the field of study.</i>	0/2	
	Discussion of limitations <i>Evaluate the thoroughness of the discussion regarding the limitations of the literature review.</i>	0/2	
	Suggestions for future research <i>Assess the clarity and relevance of the suggestions for future research provided in the discussion.</i>	0/2	
	Overall coherence and strength of the discussion <i>Evaluate the overall coherence and strength of the discussion section in presenting a well-rounded interpretation of the literature.</i>	0/3	
Literature Review	Depth/breadth of the references <i>Assess the depth and breadth of the literature review, considering the variety and relevance of the referenced studies.</i>	0/2	0/10
	Timeliness of the references <i>Evaluate the timeliness of the references, ensuring that recent and relevant studies are included.</i>	0/2	
	Identification of gaps in the existing research <i>Assess the identification and discussion of gaps in the existing research within the literature review.</i>	0/2	
	Relevance of the literature to the addressed research topic <i>Evaluate the relevance of the literature cited to the specific research topic of the literature review.</i>	0/4	
Innovation and Contribution	Originality of the research contribution <i>Assess the originality of the literature review's contribution to the field, considering its unique insights or perspectives.</i>	0/3	0/5
	Significance of the study in advancing the field <i>Evaluate the significance of the literature review in advancing the understanding or knowledge within the field of study.</i>	0/2	
Clarity and Writing Style	Clarity of expression <i>Evaluate the clarity of language and expression throughout the literature review article.</i>	0/3	0/15
	Organization <i>Assess the overall organization and structure of the literature review for coherence and logical flow.</i>	0/3	
	Correct grammar <i>Evaluate the grammatical correctness of the manuscript's language (e.g., sentence structure, verb tense).</i>	0/3	
	Spelling <i>Check for spelling errors, typos, and correct usage of words throughout the manuscript.</i>	0/3	
	Appropriate use of language <i>Assess the appropriateness of language use, including vocabulary, style, and tone, ensuring alignment with scholarly writing conventions.</i>	0/3	
Conformity to Template Guidelines	Accuracy of the citation style <i>Evaluate the accuracy of the citation style, ensuring adherence to the specified guidelines.</i>	0/2	0/15
	Adherence to recommended paper structure <i>Assess whether the manuscript adheres to the recommended structure outlined in the template guidelines.</i>	0/2	
	Adherence to recommended page number limit <i>Evaluate whether the manuscript complies with the recommended page number limit as per the template guidelines.</i>	0/2	
	Appropriate keywords <i>Check the appropriateness of chosen keywords and evaluate whether they effectively represent the content of the literature review.</i>	0/2	
	Adherence of keywords to the minimum number <i>Ensure that the number of keywords aligns with the minimum specified in the template guidelines.</i>	0/2	
	Consistency in formatting <i>Assess the overall consistency in formatting elements such as font, margins, and spacing.</i>	0/2	
	General compliance with the format <i>Evaluate the general compliance of the manuscript with the specified format guidelines.</i>	0/3	
	Total score		