

CHAM Publishing – Scientific Journals

SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT FORM

Article title: [Please enter the title of the article you have been assigned here]

Article code: [Please enter the article code assigned to you here]

Name of the reviewer: [mandatory field]

Reviewer's institutional affiliation: [mandatory field]

Reviewer's ORCID iD: [mandatory field]

INFORMATION FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	
▪	The purpose of external peer review is to provide authors with guidance on how to improve their manuscript for publication.
▪	Manuscript submissions are evaluated by at least two anonymous external reviewers through a double-blind peer-review process. Please ensure that your comments preserve the anonymity of the review.
▪	Comments should be constructive and well substantiated. They should focus on the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses, suggest relevant additional literature, and clearly explain any aspects that could be further developed or elaborated.
▪	Personal criticism and abusive language are not acceptable.
▪	External reviewers are required to disclose any potential conflicts of interest that may influence the review process.
▪	Participation in the editorial processes of CHAM Publishing implies knowledge of and agreement with the terms of the Editorial Policy .
▪	The Editorial Board reserves the right to edit reviewers' form before forwarding the final review to the authors.

STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY	
I confirm that I have read and understood the applicable Editorial Policy and the responsibilities of external reviewers. AHAM Journal: https://revistas.rcaap.pt/aham/editorialpolicies CULTURA Journal: https://revistas.fcsh.unl.pt/cultura/policies RES Journal: https://revistas.fcsh.unl.pt/res/editorialpolicies	[Tick X]
I declare that I have no conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript under review.	[Tick X]

APPRAISAL OF THE ARTICLE

1 – Observations on the content:

	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
How would you assess the scientific merit and the degree of innovation?			
How would you assess the contribution of this work to the advancement of knowledge in its scientific field?			
How would you assess the validity and robustness of the arguments and conclusions?			
How would you assess the methodology and the use of sources?			
How would you assess the relevance and currency of the bibliography?			

Detailed comments on the content:

2 – Comments on writing style:

	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
How would you rate the quality of the writing?			
How would you rate the structure and coherence of the writing?			

Detailed comments on the writing style:

3 – Required revisions:

	Yes	No
Is the title sufficiently informative and does it accurately reflect the content?		
Are the main research questions and findings clearly presented in the introduction and conclusion?		
Does the manuscript present a clear and coherent argument that is consistent with the final conclusions?		
Are the main points and arguments adequately supported by the sources and references?		
Do some of the arguments require further development?		
Are there any sections of the manuscript that would benefit from being shortened?		

Are there any sections of the article that should be removed?		
Is the manuscript well written and well structured?		
Is the bibliography relevant and up to date?		
Does the reference list contain any significant omissions?		
Are the references complete and correctly formatted according to the Author–Date system of the Chicago Manual of Style (18th edition)?		
Are the data and sources used presented accurately and clearly?		
Are the figures, graphs and/or tables appropriately cited and referred to in the text, and are their captions sufficiently informative?		

Detailed comments on the required revisions:

FINAL ASSESSMENT

Would you recommend this article for publication?

Yes, and under its current form.	
Yes, but with minor modifications.	
Yes, but pending substantial corrections.	
It should not be published.	