

## TEMPLATE FOR PEER REVIEW REPORT



SALESIAN Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences is published half-yearly by the various departments of Salesian College and is edited under the responsibility of Salesian College Publication. Its main scope is to foster a keen sense of research and methodology among the aspiring academicians of Darjeeling, North Bengal and beyond. It also seeks to highlight their works and bring to light their diverse views on different subjects. Published with an aim to seek the ultimate truth behind attaining higher education, it remains open to diverse viewpoints in a spirit of dialogue and search for deeper truth, wherever it is found. The views published in its pages are those of the writers and not necessarily of the Editorial Board or of the faculty of Salesian College

**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:

Category	Unacceptable (Below Standards)	Acceptable/Good (Meets Standards)	Excellent Exceeds Standards	Score
<b>Introduction</b> (Max. Score 5)	No Clear Communication of topic. No description of subtopics. Thesis statement missing. (score 1-2)	Conveys 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 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)	
<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>Chicago Style Manual</b> (Max. Score 10)	Errors in Chicago style. Word choice informal. Citations not Chicagoformatted. (score 1-4)	Chicago style compliant, with very few errors. Scholarly style. Citations proper (score 5-8)	Completely Chicago 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)	

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

## 2. Specific Strengths of the Paper:

## 3. Specific Weaknesses of the Paper:

**SECTION B**

**(Confidential. Will not be share 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 [v] the appropriate choice)**

	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Place Check Mark [v]</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Accepted for Publication as is</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Accepted for further review/publication on re-submission by the author after having adequately addressed the errors and weaknesses specified Above.</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Rejected</b>	

-----  
**Signature (Name) of the Reviewer**

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