

Journal of Positive School Psychology



Dear Author,
Husnul Yaqin et al.

It's our great pleasure to inform you that your manuscript titled as "**Authority to Manage and Expand The Organizational Structure of Madrasah Education in Kalimantan**" has been accepted. Has been reviewed and accepted for publication in **Journal of Positive School Psychology (JPSP)** with **ISSN 2717-7564**.

You are requested to complete the further publication formalities including the final copy of the article and Article Processing Fee.

For publication kindly deposit Article processing charges.

Your article will be published in forthcoming Regular Issue **Vol. 6 No. 4 (2022)**.

With warm regards,
Editorial Board

Yilmaz Kaplan

Journal of Positive School Psychology (JPSP)

<https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/>

Scopus: <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101044228>

SJR Link: <https://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21101044228&tip=sid&clean=0>

Journal of Positive School Psychology



Manuscript Review Report

ID	: 4976
Title	: Authority to Manage and Expand The Organizational Structure of Madrasah Education in Kalimantan
Author	: Husnul Yaqin Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia husnulyaqin@uin-antasari.ac.id Syaiful Bahri Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia syaifulbahri@uin-antasari.ac.id Zainap Hartati Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palangka Raya, Indonesia Zainap.hartati@iain-palangkaraya.ac.id Subianto Karoso Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia Subiantokaroso@unesa.ac.id Suriagiri Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia suriagiri@uin-antasari.ac.id

[REVIEW RESULTS]

Double-blind review form (First reviewer)

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. We are keen to ensuring a high standard of articles published in European –American Journals, and the manuscript that is being sent to you has been submitted after a first selection process based on the agreement of the Associate Editors. In general, the standard of

manuscripts forwarded to me after the vetting is good. To this end, we would be grateful if you would, wherever possible, provide constructive feedback to enable the author(s) improve the manuscript before publication.

Please complete the table below and rate the article on the issues described. As with all double-blind review

No .	Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = Poor)	1	2	3	4
1	Originality		√		
2	Scientific Quality		√		
3	Relevance to the Field(s) of Journal		√		
4	Depth of Research		√		
5	Abstract	√			
6	Introduction		√		
7	Literature Review			√	
8	Methodology	√			
9	Results	√			
10	Discussions	√			
11	Conclusions	√			
12	References / Bibliography	√			
13	Figures				
14	Tables				

Decision regarding the paper

Accept the paper in its current format	√
Accept the paper with minor changes	
Resubmit with the major changes	
Decline the submission	

Comment

This paper is well organized and followed the manuscript guidelines of the journal to a large extent. The introduction section is good and shows the importance of the study. Literature review is adequate. Outcomes of the study are consistent with the findings. The approach used is praiseworthy. In my opinion, it should be published with no revision although implication to the research needs to be explicit

[REVIEW RESULTS]

Double-blind review form (Second reviewer)

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. We are keen to ensuring a high standard of articles published in European –American Journals, and the manuscript that is being sent to you has been submitted after a first selection process based on the agreement of the Associate Editors. In general, the standard of manuscripts forwarded to me after the vetting is good. To this end, we would be grateful if you would, wherever possible, provide constructive feedback to enable the author(s) improve the manuscript before publication.

Please complete the table below and rate the article on the issues described. As with all double-blind review

No .	Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = Poor)	1	2	3	4
1	Originality	√			
2	Scientific Quality		√		
3	Relevance to the Field(s) of Journal		√		
4	Depth of Research		√		
5	Abstract	√			
6	Introduction		√		
7	Literature Review		√		
8	Methodology	√			
9	Results	√			
10	Discussions	√			
11	Conclusions	√			
12	References / Bibliography	√			
13	Figures				
14	Tables				

Decision regarding the paper

Accept the paper in its current format	√
Accept the paper with minor changes	
Resubmit with the major changes	
Decline the submission	

Comment

I have now looked at the paper. The abstract, key words are OK. The paper is relevant to the theme of the journal and will contribute to academic debate. The paper is well structured and the APPROACH used for the study are sound. In my opinion, the subject matter of research problem is highly appreciable. It will surely make a contribution to the relevant field of research. The presentation of thoughts in the paper is notable. The paper should be published with no significant revision.

First Reviewer	:	Guzal Tulkinovna Iskandarova
Second Reviewer	:	Davronova Dildora Saidovna (An associate professor of Uzbekistan State University of World Languages)

DECISION: **ACCEPTED**