



Peer review evaluation report

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 delete the entries you do not consider significant and leave only the entry that corresponds to your judgement, adding remarks whenever the case.

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

In the third section, you may add free comments: 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.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sēnmurw – Journal of Iranian Studies



Peer review evaluation report

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):

Sēnmurw – Journal of Iranian Studies



Peer review evaluation report

Article's subject

1. Relevance of the article considering the history of the discipline:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:

2. Relevance of the article for the specialized sector:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:

3. Innovative aspects or helpfulness of the contribution:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:



Peer review evaluation report

Form and substance of the research

1. Adequacy of the methodology adopted:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:

2. Clarity and coherence of the argumentation:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:

3. Consistency of the writing form for the article's topic:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:

4. Effectiveness and appropriateness of language:

Low Weak Sufficient Good Strong Excellent

Remarks:

Sēnmurw – Journal of Iranian Studies



Peer review evaluation report

Overall evaluation

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

- [1] Yes, and it can be published as it stands.
- [2] Yes, but needs limited corrections, explained in detail in the free remarks.
- [3] Yes, but needs a thorough revision to solve the problems highlighted in the free remarks.
- [4] No, the article does not meet the quality standards and cannot be published in this form.

Sēnmurw – Journal of Iranian Studies



Peer review evaluation report

Free remarks