

Andi Kristanto

From: webhos20@chi-pnode2.websitehostserver.net on behalf of Sylwan Journal
<office@sylwan.ibles.org>
Sent: 26 June 2020 00:00
To: andikristanto@unesa.ac.id
Subject: Result of paper review

Dear Author(s)

Andi Kristanto, Jessica Tessya Salim, Hanna Maria, Leonitta Pamella, Muhammad Fahri, Setya Chendra Wibawa, and Harco Leslie Hendric Spist Warnars

This is my pleasure to inform you that the paper entitled 'Mobile Games Applications For Learning the Indonesian War National History' qualifies for publication in SYLWAN journal based upon the reviewers` positive comments on this paper.

To complete the publication process, please check the reviewers' comments in attachment and revise your paper based upon the comments if needed. Also check your paper layout to be in accord with the journal guidelines once more.

Please make your final version pdf considering 3.25cm margins from the bottom and the top of all pages. Remember not to use blank or white boxes to make the margins. It should be set from the page layout option in your word doc file.

You`ll receive the formal acceptance letter soon afterwards and the paper will be sent to the publishing department to include your paper in our current issue.

Regards

Dr. B. N. BUSZEWSKI

Editor in Chief, SYLWAN Journal,

UL BITWY WARSZAWSKIEJ 1920 R NR 3, WARSZAWA, POLAND



Sylwan Journal

REVIEW

UL BITWY WARSZAWSKIEJ 1920 R NR 3, WARSZAWA

POLAND, PL-02 362

Title of the paper:

Mobile Games Applications For Learning the Indonesian War National History

Andi Kristanto, Jessica Tessya Salim, Hanna Maria, Leonitta Pamella, Muhammad Fahri, Setya Chendra Wibawa, and Harco Leslie Hendric Spist Warnars

General evaluation

1. Title of the research paper, it's accord to the contents and goals.
2. Clarity and relevance of the problem
3. Deepness of scientific problem analysis
4. Reasoning of main propositions
5. Validity of the conclusions
6. Evaluation of the research paper structure: consistency, extent, language
7. Accuracy of the references in the text and in the list of literature
8. Research goals, object, methods, novelty and key words, pointed out at the beginning of the research paper

Weak	Modest	Average	Good	Excellent
				✓
		✓		
		✓		
		✓		
				✓
		✓		
			✓	
		✓		

General conclusion:

Accept without reservation

Accept after minor corrections made (new review is required)

Accept after major corrections made (new review is required)

Reject (indicate reasons in the comments)

✓

Further comments of the evaluator for the author (authors) of the paper:

The subject is interesting and well elaborating the body of the text. The main problem of the research should be more exact. How is the problem scientifically analyzed through the text? Reasoning of main propositions are not satisfying. The results are comprehensive and satisfying in conclusion part. The English errors need to be edited by a native English. The references are good but it is recommended that the author uses more references from the recent years. The main goals of the paper should be more crystal clear.

Name and Workplace of the evaluator:

 - Italy

Date: 2020-06-25