

Saint Claret College, Ziro
INTERVIEWS: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL IN SOCIAL SCIENCES
(ISSN: 2349-400X)

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Title of the Article:

Reviewer:

Date of Submission of Review Report:

SECTION A

(This Section will be shared with the Author)

1. Please score the article on the given parameters, as per the rubrics:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Unacceptable (Below Standards)</i>	<i>Acceptable/Good (Meets Standards)</i>	<i>Excellent (Exceeds Standards)</i>	SCORE
Introduction (Max. Score 5)	No clear communication of topic. No description of subtopics. Thesis statement missing. (score 1-2)	Coveys topic and key research questions. Mentions subtopics. Thesis statement present. (score 3-4)	Strong introduction of topic, key questions, subtopics, thesis statement. Engages the reader. (score 5)	
Literature Review (LR) (Max.Score 15)	Poor quantity and quality of LR. Not integrated or relevant to topic. (score 1-5)	Adequate number and quality. LR is cohesive and integrated to topic. (score 6-10)	Excellent number, quality, & sequence of LR. There is flow, good funneling. (score 11-15)	
Methodology& Quality of Research (Max.Score 15)	Poor and inadequate Methodology, applied poorly. Poor quality (score 1-5)	Adequate and appropriate methodology, applied correctly. Good quality. (score 6-10)	Very good choice of methodology, correct application and analysis. Excellent quality of research (score 11-15)	
Support of Thesis& Analysis (Max.Score 15)	Poor Analysis; Few /insignificant/ unsubstantiated sources supporting thesis (score 1-5)	Proper analysis & application; adequate, significant well-chosen sources. Evidence-based (score 6-10)	Excellent analysis & application; good number and use of evidence-based sources to support & argue (score 11-15)	
Conclusion	Inadequate or no	Adequate summary	Exemplary summary	

(Max. Score 5)	summary of thesis & findings, impact, limitations (score 1-2)	of thesis, findings, impact, limitations (score 3-4)	of thesis, findings, impact, limitations. Proposals for further research (score 5)	
Research Ethics (Max.Score 15)	No/ inadequate evidence of ethical compliance; evidence of ethical violation (score 0-5)	Ethical issues anticipated and addressed. No evidence of ethical violation (score 6-10)	Exemplary anticipation and implementation of ethical demands. No violation (score 11-15)	
Language & Grammar (Max.Score 10)	Poor language; Grammatical/ spelling/ punctuation errors. Readability is poor (score 1-4)	Generally good language: grammar, spelling, punctuation. Readable (score 5-8)	Free of grammatical, spelling, punctuation errors. Excellent vocabulary, short sentences, readability. (score 9-10)	
APA Style (Max.Score 10)	Errors in APA style. Word Choice informal. Citations not APA formatted. (score 1-4)	APA compliant, with very few errors. Scholarly style. Citations proper (score 5-8)	Completely APA formatted. Scholarly style. Smooth flow of writing. Citations proper. (score 9-10)	
Citations & References (Max.Score 10)	Inadequate, incorrect, incomplete citations/References. Non-functional links. (score 1-4)	Adequate and complete citations/References. Links proper. (score 5-8)	Appropriate & adequate citations. References complete. (score 9-10)	

2. Specific Strengths of the Paper:

3. Specific Weaknesses of the Paper:

SECTION B

(Confidential. Will not be shared with the Author)

If the Reviewer would like to inform the editor confidentially any additional observation on the article or related matters, please do express the same in the space given below:

SECTION C: RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the article may be:(check [√] the appropriate choice)

	<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Place check mark [√]</i>
1.	<i>Accepted for publication as is</i>	
2.	<i>Accepted for further review/publication on re-submission by the author after having adequately addressed the errors and weaknesses specified above.</i>	
3.	<i>Rejected.</i>	

Signature (Name) of the Reviewer

Kindly retain the copy of this Review for your records and for any need that might occur in future. Thank you.