Online Review (via OJS)

Mochammad Tanzil Multazam, M.Kn.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6373-1199
tanzilmultazam@umsida.ac.id
http://ojs.umsida.ac.id/index.php/rechtsidee
Kepala Pusat Pengembangan Publikasi Ilmiah UMSIDA
Tim Ahli Relawan Jurnal Indonesia

"Berbagi Bersama Giatkan Publikasi"

MATERI

- Online Review(OJS)
- Competing Interest Policy
- Review Standart

Tipe Review

- Open Peer Review
- Blind Peer Review
- Double Blind Peer Review

Step 1

- Pertimbangkan apakah artikel yang di berikan pada anda untuk di review sesuai dengan bidang keahlian anda
- Jika anda punya konflik kepentingan dengan artikel tersebut segera beritahukan pada editor
- Perhatikan deadline. Jika tidak mampu memenuhinya, sebaiknya ditolak.
- Berikan jawaban dengan cepat permohonan tersebut. Apakah menerima atau tidak tawaran untuk mereview.
- Jika menolak, lebih dianjurkan jika memberikan kontak nama yang tepat untuk mereview.
- Jika menerima untuk mereview, perlakukan dokumen review sebagai dokumen rahasia. Tidak boleh membaginya dengan orang lain tanpa seiizin editor dan penulis (melalui informasi dari editor).

Competing Interest

- Editors and Reviewers must declare their own competing interests and if necessary disqualify themselves from involvement in the assessment of a manuscript.
- Common reasons for editors and reviewers to recuse themselves from the peer review process may include but are not limited to:
  1. They work at the same institution or organization as an author, currently or recently
  2. They collaborate with an author, currently or recently
  3. They have published with an author during the past 5 years
  4. They have held grants with an author, currently or recently
  5. They have a personal relationship with an author that does not allow them to evaluate the manuscript objectively
- http://journals.plos.org/plospathogens/s/competing-interests

MS Word Tools

- Aktifkan fungsi tracking
- Aktifkan fungsi comment
- Dan gunakan tools compare jika memasuki ronde kedua review
- Semuanya bisa diakses di menu review

Step 2

- Rangkum artikel dalam paragraf singkat.
- Berikan opini pribadi terkait artikel, terkait apakah artikel tersebut novel, menarik, dan memiliki dampak pada ilmu pengetahuan.
- Berikan opini terkait dengan standar jurnal, misal jika jurnal tujuan adalah di bidang ekonomi islam dengan topic mudharabah, maka jika artikel belum sesuai kriteria dapat disampaikan.
- Jika menemukan plagiasi, harap segera disampaikan pada editor.
- Berikan spesifik komen dan saran terkait layout dan format, judul, abstrak, pendahuluan, Abstrak gambar and/or Penekanan, Metode, kesalahan statistik, hasil, Kesimpulan dan pembahasan, bahasa dan referensi.

State of the art

capacitor placement problem [5, 5, 6].

Recently, many evolutionary methods such as GA [3, 4], evolutionary programming [7, 8], stochastic [9], PSO [6, 7, 10] have been applied to solve the power system economic dispatch problem. Generally, evolutionary methods need several trials to achieve optimal or near optimal solution and require special care in the tuning of parameters associated with it.

This research will focus on finding optimum placement at the most sensitive bus and proposing optimum sizing using PSO to improve the line losses in the IEEE 14 bus power system. A mathematical model of derivative function was used to determine the sensitive load buses. Further, the range of PSO is divided to some localities. The individual minimum and global minimum of the cost function is saved in memory, along with the corresponding particle position (in our case, shunt capacitor position). The particle position is updated in which near the position towards the individual minimum and global minimum, according to pre-specified weights assigned. In this way, the optimum sizing can be

One of the oldest academic interventions for gifted children is full-grade acceleration, which entails permitting a child to skip a grade in order to attend a grade one year earlier than their age peers. Leaders from gifted education's past (e.g., Hollingworth, 1926, 1942; Stanley, 1976; Terman, 1954; Terman & Oden, 1947) recognized the potential benefits of full-grade acceleration. These early opinions are still mainstream among gifted education experts, who often find that accelerated gifted children outperform their non-accelerated age peers on academic, social, and self-esteem measures (Assouline, Colangelo, VanTassel-Baska, & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 2015; Rogers, 2007).

In the 21st century research on full-grade acceleration continues. Recently researchers studying full-grade acceleration have found that accelerated gifted children outperform their (older) classmates on nearly every academic outcome, including high school and college grades, standardized tests, and advanced degree attainment (Cronbach, 1996; McClarty, 2015a; Park, Lubinski, & Benbow, 2013). These academic benefits usually do not come at a cost to social or emotional development (Gagné & Gagnier, 2004; Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, & Peternel, 2010; Rogers, 2007). The only exception to these results that we were able to find was a Dutch study in which accelerated students' (older) peers rated them less positively as the students who had not been accelerated—especially if the accelerated students were male. However, accelerated students in this study had higher academic self-concepts than their older classmates (Hoogeveen, van Hell, & Verhoeven, 2009).

Despite the long history of interest in full-grade acceleration among gifted education researchers, few studies have examined long-term adult outcomes of children who skipped a grade. The limited research is mostly focused on academic outcomes (usually in college), social outcomes, and emotional outcomes of full-grade acceleration (e.g., Cronbach, 1996; McClarty, 2015a, 2015b; Park et al., 2013). Although this research is useful, there has been almost no research on financial outcomes of full-grade acceleration. The few researchers who have investigated economic outcomes (i.e., Cronbach, 1996; McClarty, 2015b) have not reported effect sizes, a violation of reporting standards that reduces the usefulness of their research (American Educational Research Association, 2006; American Psychological Association, 2010).

Therefore, teachers, administrators, parents, and advocates of gifted children have little information about the economic consequences of full-grade acceleration—a gap we hope to fill. Given the

* Corresponding author. Department of Behavioral Science, Utah Valley University, 800 W. University Parkway MC 115, Orem, UT 84058 United States.
E-mail address: rwarne@uvu.edu (R.T. Warne).
[1] Jonathan K Liu is now affiliated with the Department of Counseling Psychology & Special Education, Brigham Young University.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.10.004

The last sentence of the abstract (lines 26-27) is incomplete.

Lines 41-42 -- this sentence needs rewriting because at the moment it says that biotic heterogeneity is an important determinant of biotic heterogeneity!

Lines 81-82 -- the word 'if' should be used as a conditional. Here the correct word is 'whether'. Also, data are plural; this sentence has both singular and plural. So the sentence should read 'Finally, we assess whether species abundance data are needed to obtain useful predictions, or whether the more easily obtainable presence-absence data are adequate.'

Lines 93-94 -- if the idea was NOT to sample any environmental gradient then why were transects used?

'Data collection' section (and rest of manuscript): I could find no mention of WHEN the floristic data were collected.

Line 224 -- latitude and longitude were tested, apparently. Why is there no mention of these in the methods or Table 1, or anywhere else in the manuscript? Was anything else tested but not reported?

Line 229 -- I do not follow "All twenty indicator species of the richer soils". In Fig.2, I count 18 indicators (and 21 at the second level for the richer soils). I have no idea what is being referred to here.

Discussion score: 4.5 / 5

I think the authors should change the focus of their analysis to directly simulate the sampling distribution of the difference between the CoG observed two decades apart. That is, the parameter of interest should be directly: Delta(CoG) = CoG_obs,2 - CoG_obs,1. The bootstrap could be used to simulate the sampling distribution of this statistics, and then to compare how extreme is the observed value. Weights informed by how the data were collected could be incorporated in the analysis. In my opinion, more, not less, assumptions would strengthen the analysis.

As it stands, the paper is confusing. I think that the authors should provide for example R code to make their research reproducible. Finally, one could also use a bivariate normal distribution to estimate CoG and use the existing R package ellipse to directly compute confidence ellipse. This approach may also enable to study more ecological relevant aspect of [redacted] such as [redacted]. An abstract construct like the CoG is likely to lie in the middle of [redacted] for [redacted], which is unfortunate. A contour of land masses would have been nice on the figure. I very much encourage the authors to further develop [redacted] to assess statistical significance.

REVIEW EXAMPLE

References

[1] Anonymous authors (2012) A [redacted] (unpublished manuscript) - Peerage of Science

[2] Tufte, E. (2006) Beautiful Evidence. 1st edition. Graphic Press.

[3] Efron, B. (1979) Bootstrap Methods: Another Look at the Jackknife. Annals of Statistics 7:1-26.

[4] Rubin, D. (1981) The Bayesian Bootstrap. The Annals of Statistics 9:130-134.

Critique

Unfortunately, there are substantial flaws in the simulations and in reporting of simulated data which prevent me from recommending publication, at present.

REVIEW EXAMPLE

A crucial flaw is that the authors "hide" the simulation data (on which the major conclusions are based). Appendix-1, comparing simulated and observed data, simply states whether the comparison was "high," "low," or "overlap/non-significant difference". It is necessary for the authors to report (numerically) the simulated data range, to show whether the observed data falls within, and "how close" the real and simulated data are, which is key information for readers. This is often shown graphically (see (16) Fig 3, (17) Fig 3, (18) Fig 6), but the authors could simply replace "high", "low" etc., with the numerical range from the simulations.

Additionally more simulation replicates are vitally needed- only 10 were performed per scenario, while similar investigations typically involve >500-1000 replicates (13,16,19- 24). Fifty is a bare minimum, to obtain 90-95% intervals to compare to the observed data. The authors

Step 3

- Pastikan anda berkomentar dengan sopan dan membangun, tidak memperlihatkan identitas. (jika blind or double blind review)
- Berikan argumentasi dan data disetiap komentar. Agar penulis dan editor dapat memahami kesalahan yang ada di artikel.
- Biasakan memberikan referensi dalam setiap komentar.

Step 4

Berikan rekomendasi sesuai dengan opsi yang ada (Versi OJS):

- Accept Submission : Menyatakan naskah layak terbit
- Revisions Required : Menyatakan naskah butuh perbaikan, bisa minor bisa mayor
- Resubmit for Review: Menyatakan naskah butuh perbaikan, dan mohon dikembalikan padanya untuk di review ronde ke dua.
- Resubmit Elsewhere : Menyatakan naskah butuh perbaikan, dan mohon dikembalikan ke reviewer lain untuk di review ronde ke dua.
- Decline Submission : Menyatakan naskah tidak layak di terbitkan.
- See Comments : Menyatakan bahwa rekomendasi ada di komentar.

Keputusan Akhir

- Keputusan akhir diterima atau tidaknya artikel ada di Editor.
- Reviewer hanya berposisi sebagai pemberi rekomendasi.

"Berbagi Bersama Giatkan Publikasi"

Mochammad Tanzil Multazam:

I believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the manuscript, "STANDARD CONTRACT IN FINANCING AT SHARIA' BANK," which has been submitted to Rechtsidee. The submission's abstract is inserted below, and I hope that you will consider undertaking this important task for us.

Please click Submission URL below by 2017-05-26 or before, to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation.

The review itself is due 2017-06-16.

Submission URL: http://ojs.umsida.ac.id/index.php/rechtsidee/reviewer/submission/118?key=ACCESS_KEY

Once completed you will be eligible to get official credit for this review on Publons.com.
Simply forward the "thank you for reviewing" email to reviews@publons.com to get started.

You can learn more about Publons and how it benefits you here:
https://publons.com/in/ums/

Thank you for considering this request.

REVIEW SCHEDULE

Editor's Request	2017-05-19
Your Response	—
Review Submitted	—
Review Due	2017-06-16

REVIEW STEPS

1. Notify the submission's editor as to whether you will undertake the review.
   Response Will do the review Unable to do the review
2. If you are going to do the review, consult Reviewer Guidelines below.
3. Click on file names to download and review (on screen or by printing) the files associated with this submission.
   Submission will be made available, if and when reviewer agrees to undertake review
4. Declare whether or not you have competing interests with regard to this research (see CI POLICY).
5. Click on icon to fill in the review form.
   Review Form
6. In addition, you can upload files for the editor and/or author to consult.
   Uploaded files None
   Browse... No file selected. Upload
   ENSURING A BLIND REVIEW
7. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.
   Recommendation Choose One Submit Review To Editor

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Before you accept or decline an invitation to review, consider the following questions:

1. Does the article match your area of expertise? Only accept if you feel you can provide a high quality review.
2. Do you have a potential conflict of interest? Disclose this to the editor when you respond.
3. Do you have time? Reviewing can be a lot of work – before you commit, make sure you can meet the deadline.

References

- https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/how-to-conduct-a-review
- https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts
- http://ojs.umsida.ac.id/index.php/rechtsidee/about/editorialPolicies#custom-2
- http://journals.plos.org/plospathogens/s/competing-interests