

# Review Form

## PART I

**Article Title:**

**Identifying the speech errors in a talkshow from a podcast: a case on speech disfluency**

## PART II

**Evaluation** (Please assign the score for each item below)

5=Excellent    4=Good    3=Average    2=Below Average    1=Poor    n/a=Not Applicable

Items	Grade
<b>Overall evaluation on the paper</b>	
1. Contribution to existing knowledge	3
2. Novel ideas/concepts/techniques	3
3. Complete and accurate figures and tables	4
4. Appropriate formatting and structure	4
5. Readability	3
6. Correct analysis	4
7. Soundness of methodology	4
8. Evidence supports conclusion	3
9. Adequacy of literature review	3
10. Clear, concise and interesting writing	4
<b>❖ Summary</b>	
<b>❖ Strengths</b>	
Methodology, analysis, figure and table are clear and accurate.	
<b>❖ Weaknesses</b>	
References need to be added more since a good paper should contain at least 20-25	
<b>❖ Suggestions to Author/s</b>	

--

**PART III**

<b>Recommend the appropriate section for this paper</b> (Please mark "X" for appropriate option)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original Article
<input type="checkbox"/> Review Article
<input type="checkbox"/> Case Report
<input type="checkbox"/> Short Communication
<input type="checkbox"/> _____

**PART IV**

<b>Recommendation to Editor</b> (Please mark "X" for appropriate option)
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent, accept the submission (5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good, accept the submission with minor revisions required (4)
<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable, revisions required (3)
<input type="checkbox"/> Resubmit for review, major revisions required (2)
<input type="checkbox"/> Decline the submission (1)

## Appendix

### **Ethical Guidelines for Reviewers**

- Respect confidentiality.
- Respect copyright protection of submissions by not using in their own research or work any unpublished data, information, interpretation, or discussion from a submitted article.
- Maintain objectivity in reviewing submissions and avoid personal criticism of authors.
- Be aware of potential conflicts of interest (financial, institutional, collaborative, or other relationships between the reviewer and author) and be willing to alert the editor to these, even if it means withdrawing themselves from reviewing a manuscript.
- Be vigilant for plagiarized material and/or falsified and/or manipulated data and be willing to alert the editor if this is suspected in a manuscript.

March 9, 2023

Dear Dr. Dumaris E. Silalahi,

Thanks for your submission to *Studies in Media and Communication*.

We have the pleasure to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication. It will be published in the **Vol. 11, No. 5, 2023, special issue**.

**Title:** Identifying the Speech Errors in a Talkshow from a Podcast: A Case on Speech Disfluency

**Author(s):** Partohap Saut Raja Sihombing, Dumaris E. Silalahi, Ridwin Purba, Nanda Saputra, Semaria Eva Elita Girsang, Yanti Kristina Sinaga

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Patricia Johnson

On behalf of,  
The Editorial Board of *Studies in Media and Communication*  
Redfame Publishing