≡   **M** Gmail   🔍 Evaluation of the Quality of Online   ✕ ≛   ● Active ▾   ⑦ ⚙ ⦂⦂⦂   Google 🔵

✉ Compose

Mail

□ Inbox

☆ Starred

⑤ Snoozed

More

Meet

Labels +

← ▤ ⊙ 🗑 ✉ ⊙ ⊖ ▦ ▭ ⦂   40 of many ‹ › ▬ ▾

Your manuscript has been received - Budi Utomo et al.- Evaluation of the ==Quality== of ==Online== Learning During the Covid-19 Pandemic: An Empirical Study at Indonesian University Inbox ×

Res Militaris Editor <resmilitaris.editor@gmail.com>   Wed, 21 Dec 2021, 09:54 ☆ ↩ ⦂
to ditihisampano, me, haudi, maria.ae, yudhonrapriadi, H.LayeTuti, trisiswanto ▾

Dear Author,

We are pleased to inform you that your Manuscript entitled " ==Evaluation== of the ==Quality== of ==Online== Learning During the Covid-19 Pandemic: An Empirical Study at Indonesian University" has been received for publication in **Journal of Res Militaris**. This paper will be reviewed for further process.

Thank you for your interest in our journal.

Regards,

Editorial Team
Res Militaris
Scopus Q3 - Scimago Q4
Scopus link: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100908447
Journal link: http://resmilitaris.net

Res Militaris Editor <resmilitaris.editor@gmail.com>   Wed, 21 Dec 2021, 10:00 ☆ ↩ ⦂
to maria.ae@upnj.ac.id, ditihisampano, me, haudi, maria.ae, yudhonrapriadi, H.LayeTuti, trisiswanto ▾

≡   **M** Gmail   🔍 Evaluation of the Quality of Online   ✕ ≛   ● Active ▾   ⑦ ⚙ ⦂⦂⦂   Google 🔵

✉ Compose

Mail

□ Inbox

☆ Starred

⑤ Snoozed

More

Meet

Labels +

← ▤ ⊙ 🗑 ✉ ⊙ ⊖ ▦ ▭ ⦂   30 of many ‹ › ▬ ▾

Scopus link: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100908447
Journal link: http://resmilitaris.net

Res Militaris Editor <resmilitaris.editor@gmail.com>   31 Dec 2021, 10:00 ☆ ↩ ⦂
to maria.ae@upnj.ac.id, ditihisampano, me, haudi, maria.ae, yudhonrapriadi, H.LayeTuti, trisiswanto ▾

Dear Author,

Please revise your papers according our reviewers team comment below

Abstract
• Sometimes written as an afterthought, the abstract is of extreme importance as in many instances this section is what is initially previewed by readership to determine if the remainder of the article is worth reading. This is the authors opportunity to draw the reader into the study and entice them to read the rest of the article.
• The abstract is a summary of the article or study written in 3rd person allowing the readers to get a quick glance of what the contents of the article include.
• Writing an abstract is rather challenging as being brief, accurate and concise are requisite.
• The headings and structure for an abstract are usually provided in the instructions for authors.
• In some instances, the abstract may change slightly pending content revisions required during the peer ==review== process.
• Therefore it often works well to complete this portion of the manuscript last. Remember the abstract should be able to stand alone and should be as succinct as possible.

Introduction and ==Review== of Literature
• The introduction is one of the more difficult portions of the manuscript to write. Past studies are used to set the stage or provide the reader with information regarding the necessity of the represented project.
For an introduction to work properly the reader must feel that the research question is clear, concise, and worthy of study.

For an introduction to work properly the reader must feel that the research question is clear, concise, and worthy of study.

• A competent introduction should include at least four key concepts: 1) significance of the topic, the information gap in the available literature associated with the topic; 2) a literature review in support of the key questions; 4) subsequently developed purposes/objectives and hypotheses.

Methods

• The methods section should clearly describe the specific design of the study and provide clear and concise description of the procedures that were performed.

The purpose of sufficient detail in the methods section is so that an appropriately trained person would be able to replicate your experiments.

• There should be complete transparency when describing the study.

• A clear methods section should contain the following information: 1) the population and equipment used in the study; 2) how the population and equipment were prepared and what was done during the study; 3) the protocol used; 4) the outcomes and how they were measured; 5) the methods used for data analysis. Initially a brief paragraph should explain the overall procedures and study design.

• Within this first paragraph there is generally a description of inclusion and exclusion criteria which help the reader understand the population used. Paragraphs that follow should describe in more detail the procedures followed for the study. A clear description of how data was gathered is also helpful.

• For example were data gathered prospectively or retrospectively? Who if anyone was blinded, and where and when was the actual data collected?

• Although it is a good idea for the authors to have justification and a rationale for their procedures, these should be saved for inclusion into the discussion section, not to be discussed in the methods section.

• However, occasionally studies supporting components of the methods section such as reliability of tests, or validation of outcome measures may be included in the methods section.

• The final portion of the methods section will include the statistical methods used to analyze the data. This does not mean that the actual results should be discussed in the methods section, as they have an entire section of their own.

• Most scientific journals support the need for all projects involving humans or animals to have up-to-date documentation of ethical approval. The methods section should include a clear statement that the researchers have obtained approval from an appropriate institutional review board.

Results and Discussion

• In most journals the results section is separate from the discussion section.

• It is important that you clearly distinguish your results from your discussion.

• The results section should describe the results only. The discussion section should put those results into a broader context.

• Report your results neutrally, as you "found them". Again, be thoughtful about content and structure.

• Think carefully about where content is placed in the overall structure of your paper. It is not appropriate to bring up additional results, not discussed in the results section, in the discussion.

• All results must first be described/presented and then discussed. Thus, the discussion should not simply be a repeat of the results section. Carefully discuss where your information is similar or different from other published evidence and why this might be so. What was different in methods or analysis, what was similar?

• Do not discuss extraneous ideas, concepts, or information not covered by your topic/paper/commentary. Be sure to carefully address all relevant results, not just the statistically significant ones or the ones that support your hypotheses.

When you must resort to speculation or opinion, be certain to state that up front using phrases such as 'we therefore speculate' or 'in the authors' opinion'.

• Remember, just as in the introduction and literature review, evidence or results cannot draw conclusions, just as previously stated, only people, scientists, researchers, and authors can!

• Finish with a concise, 3-5 sentence conclusion paragraph.

• This is not just a restatement of your results, rather is comprised of some final, summative statements that reflect the flow and outcomes of the entire paper. Do not include speculative statements or additional material, however, based upon your findings a statement about potential changes in clinical practice or future research opportunities can be provided here.

• Your results should be organised into an orderly and logical sequence. Only the most relevant results should be described in the text, to highlight the most important points. Figures, tables, and equations should be used for purposes of clarity and brevity. Data should not be reproduced in more than one form, for example in both figures and tables, without good reason.

• The purpose of the discussion is to explain the meaning of your results and why they are important.

• You should state the impact of your results compared with recent work and relate it back to the problem or question you posed in your introduction. Ensure claims are backed up by evidence and explain any complex arguments.

CONCLUSIONS

• Writing for publication can be a challenging yet satisfying endeavor.

• The ability to examine, relate, and interlink evidence, as well as to provide a peer-reviewed, disseminated product of your research labors can be rewarding.

M Gmail

🔍 Evaluation of the Quality of Online   ✕ ⊞   ● Active ▾   ⑦ ⚙ ⦙⦙⦙ Google

Compose

Mail
Inbox
Chat
Starred
Snoozed
Spaces
More

Meet
Labels +

← ⊟ ⊙ 🗑 ✉ ⊙ ⊘ ⊞ 💬 ⦙   10 of many ⟨ ⟩ ▪ ▾

• You should state the impact of your results compared with recent work and relate it back to the problem or question you posed in your introduction. Ensure claims are backed up by evidence and explain any complex arguments.

CONCLUSIONS
• Writing for publication can be a challenging yet satisfying endeavor.
• The ability to examine, relate, and interlink evidence, as well as to provide a peer-reviewed, disseminated product of your research labors can be rewarding.
• A few suggestions have been offered in this commentary that may assist the novice or the developing writer to attempt, polish, and perfect their approach to scholarly writing.
• This is for interpretation of the key results and to highlight the novelty and significance of the work. The conclusions should not summarise information already present in the article or abstract. You can also include any plans for relevant future work here.

References:
• Use APA style
• Use recent at least 5 years later references.
• Use 20 references minimum.

Editorial Team
Res Militaris
Scopus link: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100830447
Journal link: http://resmilitaris.net

Res Militaris Editor <resmilitaris.editor@gmail.com>   ⊟ 22 Dec 2022, 07:57 ☆ ↩ ⦙
to drkhkeerparriz, me, hanif, yustikurniyastati, All syarif. pti, hilawantini, maria.ae@uphsj.ac.id ▾

Dear Authors,
We would like to remind you that the invoice of your article will expire on December 20th, 2022

M Gmail

🔍 Evaluation of the Quality of Online   ✕ ⊞   ● Active ▾   ⑦ ⚙ ⦙⦙⦙ Google

Compose

Mail
Inbox
Chat
Starred
Snoozed
Spaces
More

Meet
Labels +

← ⊟ ⊙ 🗑 ✉ ⊙ ⊘ ⊞ 💬 ⦙   10 of many ⟨ ⟩ ▪ ▾

Dear Authors,
We would like to remind you that the invoice of your article will expire on December 20th, 2022.
If you have already paid, please email us proof of payment.
Your article is in the process of editing and will be published in January 2023.

Thank you and regards.

Editorial Team

Res Militaris
Scope – Social and Management Science
Scopus Q3 Journal (1P43 + Q3)
Scopus link: https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100830447
Journal link: http://resmilitaris.net
---

2 Attachments • Scanned by Gmail ⓘ   ⤓ ⛛

[Invoice RESM Re...] [Acceptance RES...]

Letter of Acceptance

23 December, 2022
Ref. Number: RESM 002022378

Budi Utomo
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Agama Buddha Smaratungga Boyolali
dinfosmaratungga@gmail.com

Hadion Wijoyo,
STMIK Dharmapala Riau
hadion.wijoyo@lecturer.stmikdharmapalariau.ac.id*

Hendi, Sekolah Tinggi Agama Buddha Dharma Widya,
hendi@stabdharmawidya.ac.id

Maria Assumpta Wikantari
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jakarta
maria.aw@upnvj.ac.id

Yudi Nur Supriadi
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jakarta
yudinursupriadi@upnvj.ac.id

Syarif
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jakarta
Ah.syarif.als@upnvj.ac.id

Tri Siswanini
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jakarta
trisiswantini@upnvj.ac.id