

Kemal Tahir Çalışmaları — PEER REVIEW FORM

Reviewer Guidance — Please Read First

- Be constructive: Show how the manuscript could be improved, even if you recommend rejection.
- Be specific: Include page / paragraph / line references for every comment.
- Justify: Instead of "the method is weak," write "the X analysis would be strengthened by a Y test, because..."

1. AUTHOR-FACING ASSESSMENT

1.1 Summary of the Manuscript

Summarize the manuscript's aim, theoretical framework, method, and main findings in your own words in a single paragraph (approximately 120–180 words). This both demonstrates that you have read the text and shows the author how the reviewer perceives the manuscript.

1.2 Overall Assessment and Contribution

Provide your view on the originality, contribution to the field, and strengths of the manuscript in 1–2 paragraphs. Evaluate the persuasiveness of the argument, the soundness of the theoretical/empirical foundation, and the value for readers. Acknowledging strengths before criticism is an important norm of reviewer ethics.

1.3 Major Comments (Numbered)

List the structural issues that must be addressed before publication, numbered: alignment between research question and method, theoretical framework, sample, analysis, interpretation, and conclusions. Provide a concrete suggestion for improvement in each item. Example: "1. The Findings section (p. 12) presents only descriptive statistics; the research question calls for a relational test — I recommend adding a correlation or regression analysis."

1.4 Minor Comments (Numbered)

List language, style, table/figure presentation, missing citations, and formatting issues, numbered. Page and line numbers help the author respond efficiently. Example: "1. p. 4, par. 2: 'claim' would be more apt than 'argument'. 2. N values are missing in Table 2."

1.5 Constructive Suggestions and Additional Resources (Optional)

If you can recommend complementary sources, alternative methods, or future research directions, share them here. This section is not mandatory; it supports the improvement of the work.

2. CONFIDENTIAL TO THE EDITOR (HIDDEN FROM THE AUTHOR)

2.1 Confidential Comments to the Editor

Provide any views you do not wish to share with the author: hesitations about the review, fit with the journal profile, reviewer suggestions, ethical concerns, suspicion of plagiarism / self-plagiarism, or further detail on conflicts of interest. This section is read only by the editor.

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Recommendation (single choice)

- ☐ Accept — Publishable as is
- ☐ Minor revision — Acceptable after small corrections; no further review needed
- ☐ Major revision — Substantial revision required; revised version subject to another review round

☐ Reject and resubmit — Reject in current form; may be resubmitted after substantial revision

☐ Reject — Not aligned with the journal's scope or with academic standards

3.2 Rationale for the Recommendation

Summarize your decision in 2–3 sentences: which considerations weigh heaviest, under what conditions could it be publishable? This short note helps the editor synthesize reviewer opinions.