

0320/RISSJ-LoA/X/2022
Letter of Acceptance (LoA)

11th October 2022



Dear author (s),

Sanusi Hasibuan¹, Selmi Miranda Sari²

^{1,2}Faculty of Sport Science, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

It is my pleasure to confirm on behalf of the editorial team of Randwick International of Social Science (RISS) Journal as well as on proxy by our publisher RIRAI, that your paper titled “**The Effort to Improve Learning Outcomes of Squat Style Long Jump with Modification of Learning Media**” *has been accepted for the publication in RISS Journal, Vol. 3 No. 4, October 2022.*

Very truly yours,



(Dr. Babayo Sule)
Editor in Chief of RISS Journal

Scopus Id: 57204074987

Orcid Id: 0000-0002-3879-4884

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Babayo_Sule

Review Result
Manuscript Evaluation Form (Reviewer 1)

1.	Title	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Satisfactory and descriptive (3)	<input type="radio"/> Reflect the indicated of the manuscript file (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments (1)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
2.	Abstract	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Conclusive (3)	<input type="radio"/> Describe the essence on the manuscript file (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments (1)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
3.	Keywords	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Adequate (2)	<input type="radio"/> Inadequate (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
4.	Introduction	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Adequate and well states the objective (3)	<input type="radio"/> Too long and/ or unrelated to the work (2)	<input type="radio"/> Insufficient and/or explicit hypothesis to be tested is missing (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments
5.	Materials and Methods	<input type="radio"/> Experiments are properly planted and checked (2)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Description and/ or experiments improvable (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
6.	Data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Data are reliable (6)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments (5)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time (4)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time (1)
7.	Interpretation and conclusion	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Properly drawn in regard to methods and data (4)	<input type="radio"/> Should be adjusted (3)	<input type="radio"/> Inefficiently supported (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments
8.	Discussion	<input type="radio"/> The relevance of the research is properly discussed (5)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Discussion could be improved (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
9.	References	<input checked="" type="radio"/> References are properly (3)	<input type="radio"/> Old- new references should be incorporated (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
10.	Is the paper concisely written?	<input type="radio"/> Yes (2)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NO- list the places that should be especially checked	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
11.	English	<input type="radio"/> Correct and understandable to multinational readership (3)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Readable (2)	<input type="radio"/> Poor	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
12.	Information contained the manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Original and conclusive (5)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Valuable confirmation (3)	<input type="radio"/> Repetition of know results (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments
13.	Your decision	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Accepted in its present form	<input type="radio"/> Could be reconsidered after minor revision	<input type="radio"/> Could be reconsidered after major revision	<input type="radio"/> Rejected (Should not be published in the journal)
14.	Your comments	The introduction provides a good, generalized background of the topic that quickly. The objective is clearly defined. The literature cited is relevant to the study. The authors provide detailed analysis, I think the paper could prove to be very interesting and useful to a very large audience, possibly making it acceptable for publication.			

Manuscript Evaluation Form (Reviewer 2)

1.	Title	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Satisfactory and descriptive (3)	<input type="radio"/> Reflect the indicated of the manuscript file (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments (1)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
2.	Abstract	<input type="radio"/> Conclusive (3)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Describe the essence on the manuscript file (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments (1)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
3.	Keywords	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Adequate (2)	<input type="radio"/> Inadequate (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
4.	Introduction	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Adequate and well states the objective (3)	<input type="radio"/> Too long and/ or unrelated to the work (2)	<input type="radio"/> Insufficient and/or explicit hypothesis to be tested is missing (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments
5.	Materials and Methods	<input type="radio"/> Experiments are properly planned and checked (2)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Description and/ or experiments improvable (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
6.	Data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Data are reliable (6)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments (5)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time (4)	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time (1)
7.	Interpretation and conclusion	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Properly drawn in regard to methods and data (4)	<input type="radio"/> Should be adjusted (3)	<input type="radio"/> Inefficiently supported (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments
8.	Discussion	<input checked="" type="radio"/> The relevance of the research is properly discussed (5)	<input type="radio"/> Discussion could be improved (2)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
9.	References	<input checked="" type="radio"/> References are properly (3)	<input type="radio"/> Old- new references should be incorporated (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
10.	Is the paper concisely written?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes (2)	<input type="radio"/> NO- list the places that should be especially checked	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
11.	English	<input type="radio"/> Correct and understandable to multinational readership (3)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Readable (2)	<input type="radio"/> Poor	<input type="radio"/> I will answer this question at a later time
12.	Information contained the manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Original and conclusive (5)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Valuable confirmation (3)	<input type="radio"/> Repetition of know results (1)	<input type="radio"/> Required modifications are indicated on the manuscript file by comments
13.	Your decision	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Accepted in its present form	<input type="radio"/> Could be reconsidered after minor revision	<input type="radio"/> Could be reconsidered after major revision	<input type="radio"/> Rejected (Should not be published in the journal)
14.	Your comments	The Introduction provides rationale as to the significance of the study. The method which is chosen by the authors is appropriate for the study. The author could demonstrate that the results obtained using the present method. The discussion appears to answer the questions raised in the Introduction. It meets the journal requirements and it is hoped that the readership of the journal will be improved through contribution of the paper.			