



## Peer Review Form (For Editorial Use Only)

Title of assessed article - \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. Structure

Introduction and conclusion	Very effective	Quite good	acceptable	poor
Theoretical framework, presentation and application	Apt, Clear and sustained throughout	Somewhat unclear or debatable	Inconsistent or irrelevant in parts	Totally obscure
Argumentation	Sustainable and convincing	Consistent overall	Inconsistent or unclear at times	Very poor to none

### 2. Appreciation of Subject

Textual Analysis	Sophisticated	Clear	Partially satisfactory	Seriously flawed
Intellectual initiative and originality	Extensive	Quite good	Somewhat present	Debatable

### 3. Use of Sources

Secondary Texts	Clearly identified and used discriminately	Identified and used with some critical evaluation	Mostly identified but without critical use or	Not always identified and little or no critical use or evaluation
Range used	Full bibliography demonstrating a wide range of research	Appropriate range and listing	Limited variety of books and journals	Not developed enough in all respects

### 4. Language

Quality of	High	Very good	Generally good	Poor
Clarity of expression	Effective and elegant	Very good overall	Not consistently clear, some mistakes	From confused to incoherent in parts



## Recommendation (please tick accordingly)

1.	Publish article without changes	
2.	Publish article with minor changes ( please mention precise observations)	
3.	Doubt about the value of publishing article due to the need for major changes	
4.	Non-publishable article	

Name of the Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the Reviewer : \_\_\_\_\_