

PEER REVIEW FORM

I. MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION

- **Manuscript Title:** [Insert Manuscript Title Here]
- **Manuscript ID:** [Insert Manuscript ID]
- **Date of Review Submission:** [DD/MM/YYYY]
- **Reviewer Name:** [Confidential – For Editorial Board Records Only]

II. EVALUATION RUBRIC

Please rate the manuscript across the following criteria using the scale below:

- **4** = Excellent / Outstanding
- **3** = Satisfactory / Good
- **2** = Needs Improvement
- **1** = Unsatisfactory / Major Deficiencies
- **N/A** = Not Applicable / Cannot Assess

Evaluation Criteria	4	3	2	1	N/A	Brief Observations
<i>A. Academic Quality & Methodology</i>						
1. Originality & Contribution: Novelty of thesis and significance to existing scientific knowledge in HSS.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	
2. Theoretical & Conceptual Framework: Clarity, appropriateness, and grounding of the theoretical model or historical framework.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	

Evaluation Criteria	4	3	2	1	N/A	Brief Observations
3. Source Grounding & Literature: Critical engagement with primary/secondary sources, up-to-date bibliography, and archival/fieldwork rigor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4. Argumentation & Evidence: Logical structure, factual backing of interpretations, and alignment between evidence and conclusions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
B. Presentation & Formatting						
5. Title & Abstract: Title is specific and content-reflective; abstract succinctly synthesizes scope, methodology, and results.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6. Structure & Organization: Logical flow of sections, coherent narrative progression, and clarity of presentation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7. Language & Style: Grammatical accuracy, appropriate academic register, clarity, and conciseness.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8. Visuals & Supplementary Data: Relevance, justification, and clarity of tables, maps, figures, or abbreviations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
C. Academic Integrity						
9. Ethics & Attribution: Proper citation practices, no evidence of plagiarism, uncredited borrowing, or redundant publication.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

III. DETAILED COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHORS

(This section will be transmitted directly to the author(s))

1. General Summary & Main Thesis

Provide a brief overview of the article's core subject, main objectives, and overall contribution to the field.

2. Key Strengths

Highlight the manuscript's strongest aspects (e.g., innovative archival findings, robust theoretical synthesis, compelling historiographical critique).

3. Major Revisions & Methodological Feedback

Detail significant issues regarding argument structure, theoretical framework, source selection, or interpretations that must be addressed.

4. Minor Revisions & Technical Corrections

List specific page/line-by-line recommendations regarding style, typography, citation formatting, or image/table simplification.

IV. CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

(This section will NOT be shared with the authors)

Provide any confidential context for the editorial board (e.g., concerns regarding academic ethics, suitability for a special issue, or recommendations in case of conflicting reviews).

V. FINAL RECOMMENDATION

(Please select one decision)

- ☐ **1. Accept Unconditionally:** Publish as is or with minor copyediting.
- ☐ **2. Accept with Minor Revisions:** Author(s) must address minor technical or stylistic feedback; no secondary review required.
- ☐ **3. Re-evaluate after Major Revisions:** Manuscript requires substantial structural, theoretical, or empirical revision and must undergo a second review round.
- ☐ **4. Reject Outright:** Unsuitable for publication due to major methodological/theoretical flaws, lack of original contribution, or being outside the journal's scope.