

## GAP GYAN - Peer Review Form Questionnaire Peer Reviewing

**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 : \_\_\_\_\_