

AL-AMEEN JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

A Peer-Reviewed, Interdisciplinary, Half-Yearly Research Journal
Published by Al-Ameen Research Foundation, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
ISSN: [to be allotted] | Website: www.alameenresearch.org

TEMPLATE FOR PEER REVIEW REPORT

AJIR/POL-07 — Version 1.0 (Draft)

Document Title	Template for Peer Review Report
Version	Draft v1.0
Status	Draft — for review and adoption by the Editorial Board
Effective / Issue Date	Proposed from Volume 1, Issue 1 (2026)
Approved By	Editorial Board & Advisory Board
Next Review Date	May – June 2027

Editorial Note: This template is sent to the assigned reviewer together with the anonymised manuscript. Section A is shared with the author to support the editorial decision. Section B is confidential and is not shared with the author. Section C records the reviewer's final recommendation.

Title of the Manuscript:
Reviewer (for editorial records only — not shared with the author):
Date of Submission of this Report:

Section A — To Be Shared with the Author

1. Please evaluate the manuscript against each of the following parameters, and assign a score for each, per the rubric below (maximum aggregate: 100):

Parameter	Unacceptable (Below Standards)	Acceptable / Good (Meets Standards)	Excellent (Exceeds Standards)	Score
Introduction (Max Score: 5)	No clear statement of the topic, Research problem, or thesis/argument; fails to orient the reader. (1–2)	Conveys the topic, key Research questions, subtopics, and thesis/argument. (3–4)	Strong, engaging introduction of topic, key questions, subtopics, and thesis/argument. (5)	

Literature Review <i>(Max Score: 15)</i>	Limited, dated, or Tangential literature; poorly integrated with the paper's argument. (1–5)	Adequate range and currency of literature; cohesive and relevant to the topic. (6–10)	Comprehensive, current, and critically engaged literature; well sequenced and clearly linked to the paper's contribution. (11–15)	
Methodology & Quality of Research <i>(Max Score: 15)</i>	Methodology inappropriate, poorly described, or inconsistently applied; weak overall quality. (1–5)	Methodology appropriate, adequately described, and correctly applied; sound quality. (6–10)	Methodology well-chosen, rigorously applied and clearly described; high quality of research. (11–15)	
Support of Thesis & Analysis <i>(Max Score: 15)</i>	Analysis is weak; thesis/argument is poorly supported; sources sparse, insignificant, or not well chosen. (1–5)	Analysis is sound and well applied; thesis is adequately supported by relevant, evidence-based sources. (6–10)	Analysis is rigorous and insightful; thesis is strongly supported by well-chosen, evidence-based sources. (11–15)	
Conclusion <i>(Max Score: 5)</i>	Conclusion missing or inadequate; does not summarise findings, implications, or limitations. (1–2)	Adequately summarises thesis, findings, implications, and limitations. (3–4)	Exemplary summary of thesis, findings, implications and limitations; offers directions for further research. (5)	
Research Ethics <i>(Max Score: 15)</i>	No or inadequate evidence of ethical compliance (e.g., consent, Do No Harm, conflict-of-interest disclosure); possible evidence of an ethical concern. (0–5)	Ethical issues are anticipated and appropriately addressed; no evidence of violation. (6–10)	Exemplary anticipation and handling of ethical demands; no violation noted. (11–15)	
Language & Grammar <i>(Max Score: 10)</i>	Frequent grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors that hinder readability. (1–4)	Generally clear language with minor errors; readable. (5–8)	Precise, fluent language, free of errors, with excellent readability. (9–10)	
Style & Referencing (APA) <i>(Max Score: 10)</i>	Significant deviations from APA style; informal tone; citations incomplete or incorrectly formatted. (1–4)	Mostly APA-compliant with minor errors; appropriately scholarly tone; citations generally correct. (5–8)	Fully APA-compliant; consistently scholarly tone; citations correctly and consistently formatted. (9–10)	
Citations & References <i>(Max Score: 10)</i>	Citations/references incomplete, inconsistent, or inaccurate; broken or missing links. (1–4)	Citations and references are adequate, accurate, and largely complete; links functional. (5–8)	Citations and references are complete, accurate, and appropriately	

			comprehensive; all links functional. (9–10)	
Total (Max 100)				

2. Specific Strengths of the Manuscript

3. Specific Weaknesses of the Manuscript / Suggestions for Improvement

Section B — Confidential (Not Shared with the Author)

If you wish to bring any Additional Observation — about the Manuscript, a possible Conflict of Interest, or any Ethical concern — Confidentially to the attention of the Editor-in-Chief, please record it below.

Section C — Reviewer's Recommendation

Recommendation	Tick [✓] one
1. Accepted for Publication as is.	
2. Accepted for Publication subject to Revision and Re-Submission, after the Author(s) have adequately addressed the issues identified above.	
3. Rejected.	

Signature (Name) of the Reviewer:

Editorial Note: Please retain a copy of this report for your records. Thank you for your service to Al-Ameen Journal of Interdisciplinary Research.