

**ECONOMIC DIALOGUE***International Journal of Policy and Practice · Department of Economics, Virtual University of Pakistan***MANUSCRIPT PEER REVIEW FORM***Reviewer Evaluation & Recommendation Report*

|                              |                          |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Manuscript ID:</b>        |                          |
| <b>Form Version / Issue:</b> | EDIJPP-PRF-02            |
| <b>Review Type:</b>          | Double-Blind Peer Review |

**1. Reviewer Declaration**

By completing and submitting this review, the undersigned reviewer confirms the following in accordance with COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers:

- ☐ I have no conflict of interest with the author(s) or the subject matter of this manuscript.
- ☐ I will treat this manuscript as confidential and will not share, cite, or discuss its content prior to publication.
- ☐ I am qualified in the relevant subject area to provide a competent evaluation of this manuscript.
- ☐ This review reflects my independent, unbiased, and professional academic judgment.
- ☐ I confirm ethical compliance with COPE guidelines throughout this review process.

**2. Manuscript Information**

|                                   |                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Manuscript ID:</b>             |                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Article Type:</b>              | <input type="checkbox"/> Original Research <input type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Case Study <input type="checkbox"/> Short Communication |
| <b>Subject Area / Discipline:</b> |                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Round of Review:</b>           | <input type="checkbox"/> First Round <input type="checkbox"/> Second Round <input type="checkbox"/> Third Round                                             |
| <b>Reviewer Code:</b>             | (Assigned by Editorial Office)                                                                                                                              |

**3. Evaluation Criteria (12 Core Criteria)**

Please rate each criterion on a scale of 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent). Mark N/A if not applicable.

| #  | Evaluation Criterion                                               | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        | N/A                      |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1  | Title & Abstract accurately and clearly represent the study        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2  | Introduction establishes context, rationale, and research gap      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3  | Literature review is current, relevant, and adequately cited       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4  | Research objectives / questions / hypotheses are clearly stated    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5  | Methodology (design, sampling, instruments) is appropriate         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6  | Data analysis techniques are appropriate and correctly applied     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7  | Results are presented clearly, logically, and supported by data    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8  | Discussion adequately interprets findings in light of literature   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9  | Conclusion is supported by results and addresses objectives        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10 | References are accurate, adequate, and follow journal style        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11 | Language, grammar, and academic writing are of publishable quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12 | Originality and overall contribution to the field                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Total Score (out of 60): \_\_\_\_\_ Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_

## 4. Detailed Comments

### Major Strengths

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

### Major Concerns

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

### Required Revisions

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

### Comments to Authors

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

## 5. Methodology Assessment

| Methodology Component                                                  | Yes                      | No                       | Partial                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Research design is appropriate for the stated objectives               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sampling / data collection procedure is adequate and clearly described | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Statistical / analytical methods are appropriate and correctly applied | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ethical approval / informed consent (where applicable) is reported     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Methods are described in sufficient detail to be reproducible          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## 6. Ethics & Integrity

*In line with COPE, HEC, and DOAJ integrity requirements, please confirm the following:*

- ☐ Plagiarism / similarity index is within journal policy (<19% per HEC).
- ☐ Ethical approval / IRB reference is reported, where applicable.
- ☐ Sources, data, and figures are properly cited and attributed.
- ☐ No apparent evidence of research or publication misconduct.
- ☐ Data availability and any conflicts of interest are adequately addressed.

## 7. Revision Requirements

### Major Revisions

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

### Minor Revisions

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

### Estimated Time Required for Revisions

☐ Less than 2 weeks    ☐ 2–4 weeks    ☐ 1–2 months    ☐ More than 2 months

## 8. Editorial Recommendation

Based on the overall evaluation above, my recommendation to the Editor is:

- ☐ Accept — Suitable for publication as submitted
- ☐ Minor Revision — No further review required
- ☐ Major Revision — Requires re-review
- ☐ Reject — Not suitable for publication in this journal
- ☐ Reject & Resubmit — Outside journal scope / substantial rework needed

## 9. Confidential Comments to Editor

These comments will not be shared with the author(s).

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

## 10. Reviewer Certification & Signature

I certify that the information and assessment provided in this form are accurate and represent my independent professional judgment.

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Reviewer Name:</b>             |  |
| <b>Affiliation / Institution:</b> |  |
| <b>ORCID iD:</b>                  |  |

\_\_\_\_\_  
Reviewer's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date