



Research Analysis & Assessment Report

RAAR

The article is accepted



Great Britain
Journals Press

UNITED KINGDOM





Author

Dr Douglas Wiens

University/Institution

University of Alberta

Title of Research

A Note on the Linguistic and Statistical Equivalence of MSF and DWB

Expected Publishing Journal

LJRS-X Volume 24, Issue 13 Version 1, September, 2024

Reviewing Journal

London Journal of Research In Science-X

Editor ID

#5433

Reviewer IDs

#QUEZHM & #KRWTBY

SECTION A

THEME

OVERALL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH ON THE CORE PARAMETERS

SECTION A.1

INTEGRITY & ANALYSIS OF THEME

HOW IMPACTFUL IS THIS THEME



117.28 /150.00
Reviewer I

119.15 /150.00
Reviewer II

118.22 /150.00
Average

SECTION A.1.1

THEME ANALYSIS AND EXPLORATION

HOW AUTHOR HAS ANALYZED AND, EXPLORED THE THEME OF THE RESEARCH?



23.68 /30.00
Reviewer I

24.07 /30.00
Reviewer II

23.88 /30.00
Average

SECTION A.1.2

CONCEPT ORIGINALITY/BREAKTHROUGH

THIS DOES NOT REFER TO PLAGIARISM. THIS MEANS HOW MUCH ENHANCED IN FIELD AUTHOR HAS MADE WITH RESPECT TO THE PREVIOUS REFERENCED RESEARCH



15.71 /20.00
Reviewer I

15.97 /20.00
Reviewer II

15.84 /20.00
Average

SECTION A.1.3

PRESENTED CONCEPT

THIS MEASURES HOW MUCH SUFFICIENTLY NOVEL IS THE ARTICLE AND HAS ADDED NEW KNOWLEDGE TO THE STREAM



15.66 /20.00
Reviewer I

15.90 /20.00
Reviewer II

15.78 /20.00
Average

SECTION A.1.4

HOW FUNDAMENTAL THE CONCEPT IS?

HOW CLOSE THE CONCEPT IS TO THE FUNDAMENTAL FOUNDATION OR BASIS OF THE CORRESPONDING RESEARCH IN THE STREAM? GIVEN MORE MARK IF IT IS MORE FUNDAMENTAL.



07.85 /10.00
Reviewer I

07.98 /10.00
Reviewer II

07.92 /10.00
Average

SECTION A.1.5

DEPTH OF THE RESEARCH

THE DEPTH OF THEME AND RESEARCH WORK



23.20 /30.00
Reviewer I

23.56 /30.00
Reviewer II

23.38 /30.00
Average

SECTION A.1.6**THE SCOPE OF STREAM**

HOW IS THE ARTICLE RELATED TO THE SCOPE OF THE STREAM?



07.86 /10.00

Reviewer I

07.96 /10.00

Reviewer II

07.91 /10.00

Average

SECTION A.1.7**MEANINGFUL INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS**

HOW LOGICALLY HAS THE AUTHOR INTERPRETED THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY



08.04 /10.00

Reviewer I

08.18 /10.00

Reviewer II

08.11 /10.00

Average

SECTION A.1.8**LOGICAL CONCLUSIONS**

WERE ANY LOGICAL CONCLUSIONS MADE BY THE AUTHOR?



07.62 /10.00

Reviewer I

07.77 /10.00

Reviewer II

07.70 /10.00

Average

SECTION A.1.9**RELEVANCE OF THE ARTICLE**

HOW RELEVANT IS THE RESEARCH TOPIC IS WITH RESPECT TO THE CURRENT NEEDS IN THE STREAM?



07.66 /10.00


Reviewer I

07.76 /10.00

Reviewer II

07.71 /10.00

Average

SECTION A.2**EXTENSIBILITY OF RESEARCH**

27.39 /35.00

Reviewer I

27.72 /35.00

Reviewer II

27.56 /35.00

Average

SECTION A.2.1**FLEXIBILITY OF THEORY**

THE CONSISTENCY OF THE CONCLUSION WITH RESPECT TO THE THEORY



11.64 /15.00

Reviewer I

11.79 /15.00

Reviewer II

11.72 /15.00

Average

SECTION A.2.2**FUTURE ASPECTS OF RESEARCH**

WHETHER THE RESEARCH TOPIC IS A HOT TOPIC OF ITS STREAM



07.77 /10.00

Reviewer I

07.87 /10.00

Reviewer II

07.82 /10.00

Average

SECTION A.2.3**FLEXIBILITY OF INPUT DATA**

IF THE RESULTS ARE CONSISTENT EVEN IF THE INPUT DATA IS CHANGED



07.98 /10.00

Reviewer I

08.06 /10.00

Reviewer II

08.02 /10.00

Average

SECTION A.3**APPLICATION OF RESEARCH**

27.37 /35.00

Reviewer I

27.66 /35.00

Reviewer II

27.52 /35.00

Average

SECTION A.3.1**DIRECT IMPACT OF THE RESEARCH TO INDUSTRIES**

HOW MUCH THE RESEARCH IMPACTS DIRECTLY TO THE INDUSTRIES FOR THEIR BETTERMENT



11.79 /15.00

Reviewer I

11.91 /15.00

Reviewer II

11.85 /15.00

Average

SECTION A.3.2**APPLICATIONS TO INTERDISCIPLINARY STREAMS**

HOW MUCH IS THE RESEARCH USEFUL FOR MULTIPLE STREAMS



11.60 /15.00

Reviewer I

11.70 /15.00

Reviewer II

11.65 /15.00

Average

SECTION A.3.3**COMPATIBILITY WITH LOCAL LAWS**

IT SHOULD NOT BREAK ANY LOCAL LAWS, TAKE US LAWS IF UNKNOWN



03.98 /05.00

Reviewer I

04.05 /05.00

Reviewer II

04.02 /05.00

Average

SECTION B

STRUCTURAL AND COMPILATION GRADATION OF ARTICLE

FORMATTING IS PUBLISHER'S JOB, EVALUATION OF THE FOLLOWING IS BASED ON THE LAYOUT OF THE ARTICLE

SECTION B.1

INTERACTIVITY

HOW IMPACTFUL IS THIS THEME



46.64 /60.00
Reviewer I

47.90 /60.00
Reviewer II

47.27 /60.00
Average

SECTION B.1.1

PROPER HEADING

HOW AUTHOR HAS ANALYZED AND EXPLORED THEME OF THE RESEARCH?



07.99 /10.00
Reviewer I

08.20 /10.00
Reviewer II

08.10 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.1.2

FIGURES AND PHOTOGRAPHS

RELEVANCE OF THEME AND NO FIGURE SHOULD LACK CAPTIONS



07.67 /10.00
Reviewer I

07.87 /10.00
Reviewer II

07.77 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.1.3

CHARTS AND TABLES

PROPERLY AND NICELY FORMATTED



07.69 /10.00
Reviewer I

07.85 /10.00
Reviewer II

07.77 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.1.4

HIGH RESOLUTION OF IMAGES

MORE THAN 600 DPI (DOT PER INCH). MEANS GRAPHICS MUST NOT BE BLURRY



07.65 /10.00
Reviewer I

07.84 /10.00
Reviewer II

07.75 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.1.5

ASPECT RATIO

THE RATIO OF THE WIDTH TO THE HEIGHT OF AN IMAGE MUST BE CORRECT



07.81 /10.00
Reviewer I

08.11 /10.00
Reviewer II

07.96 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.1.6**VECTOR IMAGES IN CASE OF ILLUSTRATIVE FIGURES**

IF FIGURES ARE NOT PHOTOGRAPHS, THEY MUST BE IN VECTOR FORMAT



07.83 /10.00

Reviewer I

08.03 /10.00

Reviewer II

07.93 /10.00

Average

SECTION B.2**TITLE, ABSTRACT AND KEYWORDS**

15.60 /20.00

Reviewer I

16.10 /20.00

Reviewer II

15.85 /20.00

Average

SECTION B.2.1**TITLE**

THE TITLE OF THE PAPER EFFECTIVELY FRAMES THE STUDY



02.37 /03.00

Reviewer I

02.43 /03.00

Reviewer II

02.40 /03.00

Average

SECTION B.2.2**CONTAINS SPECIFIC DATA**

IT SHOULD BE RELEVANT AND SUMMARY OF WHOLE ARTICLE



01.52 /02.00

Reviewer I

01.57 /02.00

Reviewer II

01.55 /02.00

Average

SECTION B.2.3**SINGLE PARAGRAPH**

IT SHOULD BE ONLY OF SINGLE PARAGRAPH SCREEN READER SUPPORT ENABLED.



00.77 /01.00

Reviewer I

00.79 /01.00

Reviewer II

00.78 /01.00

Average

SECTION B.2.4**250 WORDS OR LESS**

250 WORDS OR LESS ARE CONSIDERED BETTER



01.51 /02.00

Reviewer I

01.54 /02.00

Reviewer II

01.53 /01.00

Average

SECTION B.2.5**GRAMMAR AND SPELLING**

SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGIES USED ARE CORRECT AND CONSISTENT



00.76 /01.00

Reviewer I

00.78 /01.00

Reviewer II

00.77 /01.00

Average

SECTION B.2.6**CLEAR AND CONCISE**

IT SHOULD HAVE GOOD READABILITY



02.36 /03.00

Reviewer I

02.45 /03.00

Reviewer II

02.41 /03.00

Average

SECTION B.2.7**TRANSLATED TO ENGLISH**

TITLE, ABSTRACT AND KEYWORDS SHOULD BE IN ENGLISH ALSO EVEN IF THE ARTICLE IS NON-ENGLISH.



03.12 /04.00

Reviewer I

03.23 /04.00

Reviewer II

03.18 /04.00

Average

SECTION B.2.8**KEYWORDS**

KEYWORDS SHOULD BE USED CORRECTLY AND CONSISTENTLY



03.19 /04.00

Reviewer I

03.31 /04.00

Reviewer II

03.25 /04.00

Average

SECTION B.3**INTRODUCTION SECTION**

11.67 /15.00

Reviewer I

12.01 /15.00

Reviewer II

11.84 /15.00

Average

SECTION B.3.1**BACKGROUND**

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF THE TOPIC SHOULD BE WELL SUMMARIZED



02.32 /03.00

Reviewer I

02.38 /03.00

Reviewer II

02.35 /03.00

Average

SECTION B.3.2**APPROPRIATE DEPTH**

IT SHOULD GO INTO THE PROPER DETAILS



02.36/03.00

Reviewer I

02.41/03.00

Reviewer II

02.39/03.00

Average

SECTION B.3.3**GOAL CLEARLY STATED**

WHAT A READER SHOULD EXPECT FROM THE ARTICLE SHOULD ALSO BE STATED



02.32/03.00

Reviewer I

02.41/03.00

Reviewer II

02.37/03.00

Average

SECTION B.3.4**REFERENCES CITED**

REFERENCE IN STANDARD FORMAT LIKE APA.



01.53/02.00

Reviewer I

01.57/02.00

Reviewer II

01.55/02.00

Average

SECTION B.3.5**TRANSITION AND FLOW**

CONTENT IN INTRODUCTION SHOULD BE CONNECTING, LOGICAL, CLEAR, EASY TO FOLLOW



01.56/02.00

Reviewer I

01.62/02.00

Reviewer II

01.59/02.00

Average

SECTION B.3.6**GRAMMAR AND SPELLING**

SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL YOU CAN JUDGE



00.78/01.00

Reviewer I

00.80/01.00

Reviewer II

00.79/01.00

Average

SECTION B.3.7**SENTENCE/PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE**

SUBHEADINGS IN INTRODUCTION SECTION



00.80/01.00

Reviewer I

00.82/01.00

Reviewer II

00.81/01.00

Average

SECTION B.4

MATERIAL & METHODS SECTION



08.00 /10.00
Reviewer I

08.26 /10.00
Reviewer II

08.13 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.4.1

COMPLETE AND DETAILED

METHOD SPECIFIED SHOULD BE REPRODUCIBLE



03.29 /04.00
Reviewer I


03.41 /04.00
Reviewer II

03.35 /04.00
Average

SECTION B.4.2

REFERENCE CITED

REFERENCES ARE GIVEN IN A STANDARD STYLE. FOR EXAMPLE, APA



01.56 /02.00
Reviewer I

01.61 /02.00
Reviewer II

01.59 /02.00
Average

SECTION B.4.3

CORRECT FORMAT

METHOD SHOULD BE WELL STRUCTURED



01.58 /02.00
Reviewer I

01.63 /02.00
Reviewer II

01.61 /02.00
Average

SECTION B.4.4

GRAMMAR AND SPELLING

THOROUGH SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL THIS PARAMETER IS JUDGED



00.77 /01.00
Reviewer I

00.79 /01.00
Reviewer II

00.78 /01.00
Average

SECTION B.4.5

SENTENCE/PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE

SEPARATE SUBSECTIONS FOR MATERIAL AND PROCEDURE



00.80 /01.00
Reviewer I

00.82 /01.00
Reviewer II

00.81 /01.00
Average

SECTION B.5

ARTICLE CONTENT



15.90 /20.00
Reviewer I

16.38 /20.00
Reviewer II

16.14 /20.00
Average

SECTION B.5.1

APPROPRIATE LENGTH

LENGTH OF THE ARTICLE SHOULD NEITHER BE TOO LONG NOR TOO SHORT DEPENDING ON THE TYPE OF ARTICLE (REVIEW/ORIGINAL).



04.06 /05.00
Reviewer I

04.22 /05.00
Reviewer II

04.14 /05.00
Average

SECTION B.5.2

REFERENCE CITED

REFERENCES ARE GIVEN IN A STANDARD STYLE IN THE WHOLE ARTICLE. FOR EXAMPLE, APA



02.42 /03.00
Reviewer I

02.48 /03.00
Reviewer II

02.45 /03.00
Average

SECTION B.5.3

TRANSITION AND FLOW

ARTICLE'S CONTENTS SHOULD BE CONNECTING, LOGICAL, CLEAR, EASY TO FOLLOW



01.59 /02.00
Reviewer I

01.63 /02.00
Reviewer II

01.61 /02.00
Average

SECTION B.5.4

GRAMMAR AND SPELLING

THOROUGH SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL THIS PARAMETER IS JUDGED FOR THE WHOLE ARTICLE



03.84 /05.00
Reviewer I

03.96 /05.00
Reviewer II

03.90 /05.00
Average

SECTION B.5.5

SENTENCE/PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE

PROPER STRUCTURE OF THE WHOLE ARTICLE



03.99 /05.00
Reviewer I

04.09 /05.00
Reviewer II

04.04 /05.00
Average

SECTION B.6

RESULTS SECTION

IF RESULTS SECTION IS NOT REQUIRED, MARK NR



07.92 /10.00
Reviewer I

08.02 /10.00
Reviewer II

07.97 /10.00
Average

SECTION B.6.1

WELL ORGANIZED RESULTS

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS SECTION



02.37 /03.00
Reviewer I

02.40 /03.00
Reviewer II

02.39 /03.00
Average

SECTION B.6.2

CLEAR AND CONCISE

IT SHOULD HAVE GOOD READABILITY



01.58 /02.00
Reviewer I

01.60 /02.00
Reviewer II

01.59 /02.00
Average

SECTION B.6.3

ACCURACY OF RESULTS IN PRIMA FACIE

IF RESULT DATA LOOKS CORRECT



00.81 /01.00
Reviewer I

00.82 /01.00
Reviewer II

00.82 /01.00
Average

SECTION B.6.4

STANDALONE READABILITY

CAN ANYONE READ RESULTS SECTION WITHOUT READING WHOLE ARTICLE?



01.58 /02.00
Reviewer I

01.60 /02.00
Reviewer II

01.59 /02.00
Average

SECTION B.6.5

GRAMMAR AND SPELLING

SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL YOU CAN JUDGE



00.79 /01.00
Reviewer I

00.80 /01.00
Reviewer II

00.80 /01.00
Average

SECTION B.6.6**SENTENCE/PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE**

SEPARATE SUBSECTIONS FOR MATERIAL AND PROCEDURE



00.79 /01.00

Reviewer I

00.80 /01.00

Reviewer II

00.80 /01.00

Average

SECTION B.7**DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION SECTION**

HOW IMPACTFUL IS THIS THEME



23.83 /30.00

Reviewer I

24.33 /30.00

Reviewer II

24.08 /30.00

Average

SECTION B.7.1**OVERALL DISCUSSION**

CONCLUSION, MERITS AND DEMERITS OF THE RESEARCH SHOULD BE CLEARLY STATED



04.05 /05.00

Reviewer I

04.17 /05.00

Reviewer II

04.11 /05.00

Average

SECTION B.7.2**INTEGRATION WITH THEORY**

HOW IS THE CONCLUSION RELATED TO THE THEORY PRESENTED IN THE ARTICLE



01.59 /02.00

Reviewer I

01.63 /02.00

Reviewer II

01.61 /02.00

Average

SECTION B.7.3**REFERENCES CITED IN THE COMMENTS SECTION**

REFERENCE IN STANDARD FORMAT LIKE APA



01.59 /02.00

Reviewer I

01.63 /02.00

Reviewer II

01.61 /02.00

Average

SECTION B.7.4**CONCISE AND APPROPRIATE**

AUTHORS ARRIVED AT CLEAR, WELL-SUPPORTED AND EVIDENCE-BASED



02.41 /03.00

Reviewer I

02.47 /03.00

Reviewer II

02.44 /03.00

Average

SECTION B.7.5**LOGICAL CONCLUSIONS**

CONCLUSION DEDUCED SHOULD BE LOGICALLY CORRECT AND OBVIOUS



03.94 /05.00

Reviewer I

04.04 /05.00

Reviewer II

03.99 /05.00

Average

SECTION B.7.6**GRAMMAR AND SPELLING**

THOROUGH SEMANTIC REPORT IS SENT SEPARATELY, STILL THIS PARAMETER IS JUDGED FOR THE CONCLUSION SECTION



00.77 /01.00

Reviewer I

00.79 /01.00

Reviewer II

00.78 /01.00

Average

SECTION B.7.7**DISSENTING ARGUMENTS SCOPE**

BETTER IF VARIANCE OF EXPRESSED OPINIONS WITH THE TRADITION IS HIGH



03.95 /05.00

Reviewer I

04.00 /05.00

Reviewer II

03.98 /05.00

Average

SECTION B.7.8**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST SHOULD BE STATED



01.58 /02.00

Reviewer I

01.60 /02.00


Reviewer II

01.59 /02.00

Average

SECTION B.7.9**REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY**

LITERATURE CITED SECTION SHOULD HAVE COMPLETE CITATION INFORMATION IN STANDARD FORMAT



03.95 /05.00

Reviewer I

04.00 /05.00

Reviewer II

03.98 /05.00

Average

SECTION C**TO BE FILLED BY EDITOR**10.75 /15.00
EditorVerified by
Registrar

10.75 /15.00

SECTION C.1

NUMBER OF AUTHORS

NUMBER OF CORRESPONDING AUTHORS (MM: 10)



03.21 /05.00
Editor

Verified by
Registrar

03.21 /05.00

SECTION C.2

AUTHOR'S CREDIBILITY

AUTHORS HAVING PHD (MM: 15)



03.54 /05.00
Editor

Verified by
Registrar

03.54 /05.00

SECTION C.3

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR'S COUNTRY'S
CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH



04.00 /05.00
Editor

Verified by
Registrar

04.00 /05.00

SECTION D TOTAL & GRADE

SECTION D.1



315.33 /400
Total

A
Grade

EDITORIAL COMMENTS AND WORKFLOW NOTES

Dear Author,

We appreciate your article submission entitled:

'A Note on the Linguistic and Statistical Equivalence of MSF and DWB'

Reviewer 2

Author is generally good with detail and checks work thoroughly, but there have been one or two minor errors in work presented in the current work. And I enjoyed what clearly has the potential. I am glad that the author(s) wrote this article. It is a well-written, needed, and useful summary of the current status from a certain perspective. The author(s), however, need to be bolder and more analytical. This is an opinion piece, yet I see little opinion.

We are happy to inform you that your paper was accepted. The venue received a great many submissions of high quality. Each submission was thoroughly and extensively reviewed by our expert panels. After week-long online and offline discussions, we selected a small subset of papers to be accepted. Your paper was one of them.

The article describes that In this invited paper we establish the linguistic and statistical equivalencies between the notions MSF and DWB. The consequences are examined, with illustrative examples. And, I certainly agree with it.

Your article is with the RAAR report. As such, your paper will see expedited publishing in the Journals Press Incorporated, United States' Research in Science: Natural and Formal journal, a high impact journal in the field.

As it comes to your paper, it is perfect as is. Still, we have enclosed detailed reviews of your paper below. We hope that these will help you in your future work and look forward to your paper's final version at the time of early view!

Editorial 1

Suitable for publication in its current form. This can be a great article if appropriately updated. There are a few minor flaws, admitted, but it will mark our community for years to come.

Abstract

This paper, titled 'A Note on the Linguistic and Statistical Equivalence of MSF and DWB,' finally addresses the problem of research in Research in Science: Natural and Formal . The approach is well-described in the paper. The approach shows most excellent results across the board. This is a revolution in the making. The paper is lucidly and elegantly written.

Area

was, is, and will be one of the hottest areas of research in our community. It may be impactful in the stream; and as this paper condenses very good areas of the field, it is suitable for publishing.

Approach

The approach is absolutely well-appreciated. It is good to see how the author(s) manage to fit all the details with all clarity within the page limit, yet can come up with realistic examples and a full-fledged evaluation. None of the results leaves the slightest question open. Kudos!

Evaluation

The evaluation shows the full benefits of the approach. The author(s) do a great effort in explaining the results; their novel usage of the particular points clearly demonstrates how the few outliers can be easily attributed. Overall, this is solid and significant work.

Limitations

The work seems to have no limitations as per the journal policy.

Reproducibility

Thanks to the clear writing and the instructions provided, this reviewer was able to reproduce all results. Approach turns out be simple, yet so novel and convincing.

Presentation

Beautifully written and commendable work. '

Typesetting (format) of the article is not compatible with our journal. A lot of efforts will be required to update the article. We will appreciate if you can update the article with our standard/LaTeX template, obtainable from Journals Press Incorporated, United States manuscript department. This will also help you at the time of early view.

Bibliography

The bibliography by itself could make a publication of its own. Each and every paper is carefully commented and related to the author's works. This reviewer especially liked the citations of the collected works of other author(s), and whose long-standing contributions to the community and the field are still under-appreciated.

Summary

Points in favor:

- (+) Well-appreciated approach to research in Research in Science: Natural and Formal
- (+) Impressive results
- (+) Beautifully written

Points against:

- (-) None

Recommendation

Acceptable in the current form!

REVIEWER 1 RECOMMENDATION

Publish As It Is (The article fulfills all of the requirements listed above and is recommended for publication).

REVIEWER 2 RECOMMENDATION

Publish As It Is (The article fulfills all of the requirements listed above and is recommended for publication).

EDITORIAL RECOMMENDATION

Publish As It Is (The article fulfills all of the requirements listed above and is accepted for publication).

Semantic and Plagiarism/Originality report is to be sent separately. Marks are indicative and for academic purposes only. This report cannot be used for legal purposes.

RAAR™ is our exclusive, comprehensive, and most exhaustive-parameters based assessment in the research publishing industry. It is a proprietary and copyrighted document of Journals Press Incorporated. It can be shared only when permission to share the document or part of the document is appropriately taken from support@journalspress.com.

Our Disclaimer, Terms, Conditions, and Privacy Policy at given at <https://journalspress.com>