



## Malaysian Journal of Music

### *Reviewer Guidelines and Article Evaluation*

Journal Website: <http://ojs.upsi.edu.my/index.php/MJM>

Please state in your review report using "MJM Special Issue Reviewer Form" (attached with these guidelines) if the article fulfills the criteria below.

You are also requested to return the manuscript soft copy if you have added any annotations or comments in the document.

#### **Theoretical/Conceptual Soundness:**

1. Does the article have a main thesis statement or argument?
2. Does the article make reference to previous related research or theories?
3. Does the article justify/apply the theory, if any, behind the research?
4. Does the article should correctly interpret and appropriately synthesise relevant prior research?
5. Are any new hypotheses, if any, clearly stated and tested?

#### **Methodological Soundness:**

1. While research in the arts is generally different than more technical fields, the article should include background, objectives, subjects, methodology, data analysis and conclusions. Articles concerning the arts may present these aspects of a journal article in a style more relevant to the field (e.g. interpretation of scores or paintings for "data analysis").
2. The reviewer should comment accurately and constructively upon the quality of the material covered.
  - Is the material coherent?
  - Are the conclusions and/or implications correctly derived from the research?

#### **Contribution:**

1. Does the article bridge the knowledge gap in the discipline?
2. Does the article advance knowledge in/of the discipline?
3. Are the findings and implications significant to their field?
4. Is the paper of interest to at least a portion of the field?
5. The article should also discuss the implications of the reported project, and/or report on any conclusions or products, which may be of relevance to future research, development or practice.



### Communication:

1. Is the article acceptable in terms of linguistic accuracy, clarity and coherence?
2. Is the article clearly written and the major points easily grasped?
3. Is the argument/ thesis statement supported with adequate theories and evidence?
4. Is the article laid out in a logical format?

### Data:

1. Are tables and figures relevant?
2. Has the article been laid out according to the format required by the journal

### Overall Quality:

1. The reviewer should comment on major strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript as a written communication, independent of the design, methodology, results, and interpretation of the study.
2. The reviewer's comments to the author should be constructive, professional and specific. While being critical, reviewers should provide suggestions for improvements that would enhance the quality of the article.
3. If reviewers suspect misconduct, they should notify the Editor in Chief in confidence and should not share their concerns with other parties unless officially notified by the journal that they may do so.
4. There are also spaces for comments in the reviewer form to discuss aspects of the article that does not fit exactly into the above categories.

Chief Editor  
Malaysian Journal of Music, UPSI  
Website: <http://ojs.upsi.edu.my/index.php/MJM>