

ID	MM-DD Pengajuan	Bagian	Penulis	Judul	Status
7858	09-19	ART	Wardani, Putri, Norfitriah	Diversification of Ironwood Waste as Educational Dental...	Vol 5, No 11 (2022): Volume 5 No 11 November 2022
8110	10-14	ART	Wardani	Diversification of Ironwood Waste as Educational Dental...	Diarsipkan

1 - 2 of 2 Item

### Memulai Penyerahan Naskah Baru

[Klik Disini](#) Masuk ke langkah pertama dari lima langkah proses penyerahan naskah.

### Refbacs

**Semua** Baru ##plugins.generic.referralstatus.accepted## ##plugins.generic.referralstatus.declined##

Data Ditambah	Hits	URL	Artikel	Judul	Status	Aksi
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-01-25	1	http://google.com/search?q=publications	Diversification of Ironwood Waste as Educational Dental Keychains	- Baru	<a href="#">Edit</a>   <a href="#">Hapus</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2023-04-27	1	http://ejurnalmalahayati.ac.id/index.php/kreativ...	Diversification of Ironwood Waste as Educational Dental Keychains	- Baru	<a href="#">Edit</a>   <a href="#">Hapus</a>

1 - 2 of 2 Item

[Terbit](#) [Diabalkan](#) [Hapus](#) [Pilih semua](#)

Reviewer 1

No	Reviewer evaluation	Yes/No	Author feedback and improvements
<b>Author productivity</b>			
1.	Has the author published several articles in the field of scientific study in the last 5 years? (Check with Google Scholar)	Yes	
<b>Templates and Author Guide</b>			
2.	Is the writing in accordance with the template?	Yes	
3.	Is the writing in accordance with the writing guidelines?	Yes	
4.	Is the author, affiliation, and email correspondence appropriate?	Yes	
5.	Is the use of Indonesian appropriate?	-	
6.	Is the use of English appropriate?	Yes	
7.	Does the author use a reference manager (EndNote/Mendeley)	No	
8.	Has the author used abbreviations with necessary and adequate explanations?	Yes	
<b>Title and Abstract</b>			
9.	Does the title reflect the content?	Yes	
10.	Is the scope of the abstract: introduction to abstract, objectives, methods, results, conclusions, and keywords fulfilled?	Yes	
<b>Introduction</b>			
11.	Is the sharpness of the analysis on the background good and can answer the questions what, how, why, and what else?	Yes	
12.	Has there been an explicit gap of study, formulation of questions and novelty?	Yes	
13.	Does the article contribute to the field of science being studied?	Yes	
<b>Literature review</b>			
14.	Is the literature review appropriate and adequate?	Yes	
15.	Has the literature review used primary sources and used 80% of the journals?	Yes	
16.	Is/Are there (a) research objective?	Yes	
17.	Are there any research questions?	Yes	
<b>Methodology</b>			
18.	Has the community service methodology been clarified?	Yes	
19.	Are the instruments correct and adequate?	Yes	
20.	Is community service time logical?	Yes	

21.	Is the data analysis used correct and adequate?	Yes	
<b>Results</b>			
22.	Are the results obtained from statistical calculations/data analysis correct, appropriate, and adequate?	Yes	
23.	Are the results presented in the order of the questions and objectives?	Yes	
24.	Is the data analysis in accordance with the research objectives?	Yes	
25.	Are the pictures and/or tables of the article fully illustrated and presented in the text linked to the main text of the article?	Yes	
<b>Discussion</b>			
26.	Is the order of the discussion in accordance with the order of the questions and objectives?	Yes	
27.	Is the discussion material presented comprehensively?	Yes	
28.	Are the sections and paragraphs written adequately, well, and clearly?	Yes	
29.	Is the discussion analysis in accordance with the research results and can answer the question formulation, by comparing the research results with related theories, concepts, and research and ending with the researcher's synthesis?	Yes	
<b>Conclusion</b>			
30.	Has the conclusion answered the formulation of the question and purpose of community service?	Yes	
31.	Does the article contain directions for community service and future recommendations?	Yes	
<b>References</b>			
32.	Is the number of references between 20-30 sources and in the last 10 years?	No	

**Decision:**

**MINOR REVISION**

**Description: Major Revision/Minor Revision/Rejected/Accepted Immediately (select and write down\*)**

**Reviewer 2**

No	Reviewer evaluation	Yes/No	Author feedback and improvements
<b>Author productivity</b>			
1.	Has the author published several articles in the field of scientific study in the last 5 years? (Check with Google Scholar)	Yes	
<b>Templates and Author Guide</b>			
2.	Is the writing in accordance with the template?	Yes	
3.	Is the writing in accordance with the writing guidelines?	No	
4.	Is the author, affiliation, and email correspondence appropriate?	Yes	
5.	Is the use of Indonesian appropriate?	-	
6.	Is the use of English appropriate?	Yes	
7.	Does the author use a reference manager (EndNote/Mendeley)	No	
8.	Has the author used abbreviations with necessary and adequate explanations?	Yes	
<b>Title and Abstract</b>			
9.	Does the title reflect the content?	Yes	
10.	Is the scope of the abstract: introduction to abstract, objectives, methods, results, conclusions, and keywords fulfilled?	Yes	
<b>Introduction</b>			
11.	Is the sharpness of the analysis on the background good and can answer the questions what, how, why, and what else?	Yes	
12.	Has there been an explicit gap of study, formulation of questions and novelty?	Yes	
13.	Does the article contribute to the field of science being studied?	Yes	
<b>Literature review</b>			
14.	Is the literature review appropriate and adequate?	Yes	
15.	Has the literature review used primary sources and used 80% of the journals?	Yes	
16.	Is/Are there (a) research objective?	Yes	
17.	Are there any research questions?	Yes	
<b>Methodology</b>			
18.	Has the community service methodology been clarified?	Yes	
19.	Are the instruments correct and adequate?	Yes	
20.	Is community service time logical?	Yes	

21.	Is the data analysis used correct and adequate?	Yes	
<b>Results</b>			
22.	Are the results obtained from statistical calculations/data analysis correct, appropriate, and adequate?	Yes	
23.	Are the results presented in the order of the questions and objectives?	Yes	
24.	Is the data analysis in accordance with the research objectives?	Yes	
25.	Are the pictures and/or tables of the article fully illustrated and presented in the text linked to the main text of the article?	Yes	
<b>Discussion</b>			
26.	Is the order of the discussion in accordance with the order of the questions and objectives?	Yes	
27.	Is the discussion material presented comprehensively?	Yes	
28.	Are the sections and paragraphs written adequately, well, and clearly?	Yes	
29.	Is the discussion analysis in accordance with the research results and can answer the question formulation, by comparing the research results with related theories, concepts, and research and ending with the researcher's synthesis?	Yes	
<b>Conclusion</b>			
30.	Has the conclusion answered the formulation of the question and purpose of community service?	Yes	
31.	Does the article contain directions for community service and future recommendations?	No	
<b>References</b>			
32.	Is the number of references between 20-30 sources and in the last 10 years?	No	

**Decision: Minor Revision**

**Description:**

**Major Revision/Minor Revision/Rejected/Accepted Immediately (select and write down\*)**