Dear ATL Reviewer:

Thank you very much for your decision to review the designated paper in 30 days. Please address the following issues in your review.

1. Paper Summary in your own words.
   (This helps to know the direction of your overall view on the paper when there is a conflict between the feedback from different reviewers.)

2. How RELEVANT is this paper for Advanced Technology for Learning area?
   (How relevant are the described issues for Advanced Technology for Learning, for Technology-Based Education, educators and/or educational system developers?)

3. How SIGNIFICANT is this paper?
   (How important is the problem studied? Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?)

4. How ORIGINAL is this paper?
   (Are the problems and approaches unique and/or innovative? Is this a novel combination of existing techniques? Does the paper points out differences from related research? Does it address a new problem or one that has not been studies in depth? Does it introduce an interesting research paradigm? Does it introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? Does it introduce an evolutionary improvement or revolutionary proposal/solution?)

5. What is the overall QUALITY of this paper?
   (Is the paper technically sound? Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? Are its claims backed up? Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well-known technology? methodology? technique? Does the paper back up a theoretical idea already in the literature with experimental evidence? Does it offer a theoretical analysis of prior experimental results? Does the paper provide conclusions and recommendations for researchers/developers in designated area? Does the paper provide a summary of user (students, faculty, administrators, researchers, experts, etc.) feedback regarding the described technology/software/method/approach?)

6. Please comment on the CLARITY of this paper?
   (Is the paper well structured and well written? Does it motivate the research? Are the results described and well evaluated? Is the paper organized in a logical fashion? Is the paper written in a manner that makes it accessible to most educators and/or educational system developers? Is the paper written in clear English? Is the readability good, average or poor? Are there any presentation problems?)

7. Please comment on the appropriateness of the title, abstract and conclusion?
   (Does the paper provide meaningful conclusions and useful recommendations for researchers/developers in designated area? Does the paper provide a summary of user (students, faculty, administrators, researchers, experts, etc.) feedback regarding the described technology/software/method/approach?)

8. Any further comments, advice or explanations?
   (Please be specific and constructive, especially with respect to any negative judgements above. Point to the section(s) where an error occurs, indicate omitted references, etc.)

9. Overall recommendation
   (A – “Accept”, B – “Accept, possibly with minor revisions”, C – “Accept with mandatory major revisions and additional reviews, D – “Reject”)

10. Recommended minor revisions? (if any)

11. Recommended major Revisions? (if any)
    (In case of “C” decision, the revised paper will be reviewed again and authors will be asked to provide a short summary of the performed revisions along with the revised paper.)

12. How confident are you in your appropriateness as a referee for this paper?