

## Peer Review Form

Article Reference No:

Date of Receiving:

Title:

Is the article fits the scop of your specialty: Yes    No (please choose one)

### Part I: Comments for author

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| General Feedback  | Please provide a brief summary of your overall impressions of the document or project. |
| Specific Feedback | <b>Strengths</b><br>List specific areas where the document or project excels:          |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.</li><li>2.</li><li>3.</li></ol> <p><b>Areas for Improvement</b></p> <p>List specific areas that could benefit from revisions or enhancements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.</li><li>2.</li><li>3.</li></ol> <p><b>Suggestions</b></p> <p>Provide detailed suggestions on how to address the areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.</li><li>2.</li></ol> |
|--|--|

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
|                     | 3.  |
| Additional Comments | Include any other observations, questions, or feedback that do not fit into the above sections. |

## Part II: Comments for editor

| Questions  | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Does the title represents the content?   |     |    |
| Would you suggest any alternative title? If yes, Write it here.  |     |    |
| Has the research been published in another journal from the best of your knowledge?  |     |    |
| Does the introduction made enough justification to do such research?   |     |    |
| Is the aim is clear?   |     |    |
| Does the research needs further objectives to be addressed?  |     |    |
| Does the research type fits what has been done?  |     |    |
| Do you think the sample size large enough to disclose the aim?   |     |    |
| Are you satisfied with inclusion and exclusion criteria?   |     |    |
| Are you satisfied with sample selection methodology?   |     |    |
| Is the procedure clear and well referenced?  |     |    |
| Do you think the statistical test being used is representative in this case?   |     |    |
| Do the results presented well?   |     |    |
| Are all the figures and tables, clear and necessary?   |     |    |
| Does the author made good argumenting and discussion for his/her results?  |     |    |
| Does the author reaches a conclusion that is properly supported by literature?   |     |    |
| Does the conclusion answers the aim?   |     |    |
| Is recommendation reflects what research has found?  |     |    |
| Are there any limitations mentioned? If yes are they strong enough to make the research biased? If he/she didn't mentioned one, do you find any? |     |    |
| Does the Research include adequate references in relation to the studied title?  |     |    |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | Did the author refer to the references appropriately throughout the text?  |  |  |
|  | Have the scientific names (for biology article) been correctly applied in nomenclature decisions? Or chemical nomenclature (please, follow this link: <a href="https://iupac.org/">https://iupac.org/</a> ). |  |  |
|  | Would you like to see the Research after the proposed modification?  |  |  |
|  | Does the research require further statistical analysis?  |  |  |
|  | Does the research require further ethical consideration? -If yes how?  |  |  |
|  | Are recommending any specific academic to review this article as it fits more with his/her experience and field of study?  |  |  |

---

**Specialty:**

**Full Name:**

**Date:**

**Academic degree:**

**Tel (Mob):**

**E-mail:**

**Signature:**

**Evaluator address:**

---

- Correspondence to the following address:

- Please submit the review form online by sending it to the journal's email: [edj@hmu.edu.krd](mailto:edj@hmu.edu.krd)