

JTAF Reviewer Guide 2026

Guidance for structured double-blind peer review

Document code	JTAF-RG-2026
Version	2026.1
Date	18 September 2026
Status	Publisher Library

Aligned with JTAF Review Form 2026 Version 2, the double-blind review policy, research-integrity requirements, confidentiality rules, and the JTAF Generative AI Policy.

1. Purpose and reviewer role

Reviewers support the editor by providing an independent scholarly assessment of the manuscript. The review should be evidence-based, constructive, respectful, and focused on the work rather than the authors.

Core principle

A reviewer recommendation is advisory. The final editorial decision remains the responsibility of the JTAF Editorial Team.

2. Before accepting a review invitation

- Confirm that the manuscript falls within your area of expertise.
- Check that you can complete the review within the assigned deadline.
- Disclose any financial, professional, institutional, collaborative, or personal competing interest.
- Decline the invitation if a conflict may compromise, or reasonably appear to compromise, impartiality.
- Treat the invitation, manuscript, files, data, and editorial communication as confidential.

3. Review schedule

- Default response deadline: 1 week to accept or decline the review request.
- Default review completion deadline: 3 weeks after assignment.
- Automated reminders may be sent before and after the relevant due dates.
- If additional time is needed, contact the Editorial Office as early as possible.

4. Evaluation framework

No.	Evaluation area	What to consider
01	Relevance to Journal Scope	Fit with JTAF focus and scope.
02	Originality and Scientific Contribution	Novelty and meaningful scholarly value.
03	Research Objectives	Clarity and consistency of objectives, questions, or hypotheses.
04	Methodology	Appropriateness, validity, detail, and reproducibility where applicable.
05	Results	Clarity, internal consistency, and support by data.
06	Discussion and Conclusions	Critical interpretation, relation to literature, and evidence-based conclusions.
07	Figures, Tables and Supplementary Materials	Necessity, clarity, labeling, and consistency.
08	References and Literature	Relevance, adequacy, accuracy, and currency where needed.
09	Research Integrity and Ethics	Ethical approval, integrity, authorship, competing interests, and potential misconduct concerns.
10	Data Transparency and Reproducibility	Clarity of data sources, analyses, and Data Availability Statement.
11	Language and Overall Presentation	Structure, academic language, readability,

No.	Evaluation area	What to consider
		and organization.

5. Rating scale

Rating	Meaning
Excellent	Meets a high scholarly standard with little or no improvement required.
Good	Scientifically sound; limited improvements may be beneficial.
Needs Minor Improvement	Minor revisions are needed for clarity or presentation.
Needs Major Improvement	Substantial scientific, methodological, or presentation issues require revision.
Not Applicable	The criterion is genuinely not relevant to the manuscript.

6. Comments to the author

- Begin with the major strengths of the manuscript where appropriate.
- Separate major issues from minor issues.
- Make requests specific and actionable; identify the section, table, figure, analysis, or statement concerned.
- Explain the scientific reason for a requested change.
- Do not use insulting, dismissive, discriminatory, or personal language.
- Do not request unnecessary citations or citations primarily to the reviewer's own work.

7. Confidential comments to the editor

- Use this channel for suspected plagiarism, duplicate publication, fabrication, falsification, image manipulation, undisclosed conflicts, authorship concerns, or other sensitive integrity issues.
- Avoid making unsupported accusations to the author. State the concern and the evidence or indicators observed.
- Constructive comments intended for the author should remain in Comments to the Author.

8. Confidentiality and Generative AI

Confidentiality requirement

Manuscripts, figures, datasets, supplementary files, review notes, and editorial correspondence must not be uploaded to external Generative AI systems, chatbots, large language models, or other services that do not provide appropriate confidentiality safeguards without JTAF authorization.

9. Editorial recommendation

- Use the OJS recommendation field after completing the structured review form.

- Recommendations should be consistent with the issues identified in the review.
- The recommendation is not communicated as the final decision; the editor evaluates all reviews and editorial considerations.

10. Contact

Questions about review assignments, deadlines, or confidential integrity concerns may be sent to jtaf@faperta.unmul.ac.id or jtropicalagrifood@gmail.com. Phone/WhatsApp: +62 812 5363 4777.