

# Social and Legal Sciences 01/2018 - Peer Review Form

Article Title:

Peer Reviewer:

Date:

Signature: .....

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Statement of Problem or Purpose	Excellent statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	Good statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	Fair statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge	Poor statement of the theoretical or practical problem or challenge
Relevance of the Topic	Highly relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	Somewhat relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	Marginally relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal	Not relevant to the mission and purpose of the journal
Importance of the Topic	Great importance to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	Somewhat important to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	Marginally important to advancing thought on archival principles and practices	Not likely to advance thought on archival principles and practices
Contribution to the Literature	Provides significant original contributions to the literature	Provides important original contributions to the literature	Provides a fair summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Does not provide original contributions to the literature
Organization	Excellent organization of ideas and supporting points	Good organization of ideas and supporting points	Fair organization of ideas and supporting points	Poor organization of ideas and supporting points
Drawing and Building Upon Relevant Literature	Provides an excellent summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a good summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a fair summary of the major points in the relevant literature	Provides a poor summary of the major points in the relevant literature
Methodology	Research methodology is excellent	Research methodology is good	Research methodology is fair	Research methodology is poor

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Discussion	Thoroughly develops major points with relevant evidence and solid reasoning	Adequately develops major points with evidence and reasoning	Somewhat develops major points with evidence and reasoning	Contains major problems with the quality of the evidence and reasoning
Conclusion	Excellent conclusion with justification from evidence presented	Good conclusion with justification from evidence presented	Fair conclusion without sufficient justification from evidence presented	Poor or inadequate conclusion
Mechanics	Few to no errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	Some errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	Many errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	Major errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format

**Accept** - The article is acceptable for publication. Minor corrections may need to be made.

**Revise and Resubmit** - The article is not acceptable as submitted. Encourage the author to revise and resubmit.

**Reject** - The article does not merit publication.

## Notes