

**INTERVIEWS' TEMPLATE FOR 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>	<b>SCORE</b>
<b>Introduction</b> (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)	
<b>Literature Review (LR)</b> (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)	
<b>Methodology &amp; Quality of Research</b> (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)	
<b>Support of Thesis &amp; Analysis</b> (Max. Score 15)	Poor Analysis; Few /insignificant/ unsubstantiated sources supporting	Proper analysis & application; adequate, significant	Excellent analysis & application; good number and use of evidence-based	

15)	thesis (score 1-5)	Evidence-based (score 6-10)	sources to support & argue (score 11-15)	
<b>Conclusion</b> (Max. Score 5)	Inadequate or no summary of thesis & findings, impact, limitations (score 1-2)	Adequate summary of thesis, findings, impact, limitations (score 3-4)	Exemplary summary of thesis, findings, impact, limitations. Proposals for further research (score 5)	
<b>Research Ethics</b> (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)	
<b>Language &amp; Grammar</b> (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)	
<b>APA Style*</b> (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)	
<b>Citations &amp; References</b> (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)	

*\*If you (Reviewer) are not familiar with the APA Style conventions, you may leave this section blank. The in-house editors will then review the manuscript for the APA compliance.*

2. **Specific Strengths of the Paper:**

3. **Specific Weaknesses of the Paper:**

**SECTION B**

(Confidential. Will not be shared with the Author)

*If you would like to inform the editor confidentially any additional observation on the article or related matters, you may do so 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*

©2019

*InterViews: An Interdisciplinary Journal in Social Sciences*  
Saint Claret College, Post Box 22, Ziro—791 120, Arunachal Pradesh, India.  
e-mail: [interviews.scc@gmail.com](mailto:interviews.scc@gmail.com) website: [www.interviewsjournal.com](http://www.interviewsjournal.com)