Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for choosing to be a referee for *Sēnmurw – Journal of Iranian Studies*. Your comments and suggestion will be forwarded to the author of the contribution and will be integral part of the process of quality assessment of the article itself.

Please, do not share or disclose the content of the article you are reviewing while the process is ongoing. Your evaluation will be sent to the author of the attached article in a completely anonymous form, your name will be kept confidential as well as the author’s name. If you think you may have recognised the author by the style of the writing or by the contents of the article, please consider the possibility to opt out of the reviewing process and turn down the present engagement.

**How to provide your assessment.**

In the first section, on content and form of the article, delete the entries you do not consider significant and leave only the entry that corresponds to your judgement, adding optional remarks whenever the case.

In the second section, you may add free remarks. In case of an at least partially positive evaluation, please point out any revisions (however substantial) which you think might improve the quality of the article, while, in case of a negative evaluation, please explain briefly the reasons of your assessment.

In the third section, state your overall evaluation of the article, leaving only the assessment you think correct and deleting the other options.

Thank you for your cooperation,

*Sēnmurw* editorial group

**General information**

Reviewer’s name:

Title of the reviewed article:

Article reviewed and sent back to the redaction on (dd/Name of the month/yyyy):

**Content and structure of the article**

(Delete the entries that do not correspond to your opinion, and leave only the assessment you think correct, adding any remarks you might think relevant to the topic)

1. Relevance and innovative aspects of the article:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Optional brief remarks:

2. Adequacy of methodology and coherence of argumentation:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Optional brief remarks:

3. Clarity of language and appropriateness of form:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Optional brief remarks:

**Free remarks**

(Add any comment you deem important for the author of the article, in connection with your overall evaluation of the paper)

**Overall evaluation**

(Delete the entries that do not correspond to your opinion, and leave only the assessment you think correct)

Does the article meet the quality standards for publication in *Sēnmurw – Journal of Iranian Studies*?

● Yes, and it can be published as it stands.

● Yes, but it needs limited corrections, explained in detail in the free remarks section.

● Yes, but it needs a thorough revision to solve the problems highlighted in the free remarks section.

● No, the article does not meet the quality standards and cannot be published in this form for the reasons explained in the free remarks section.