PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENT FORM

Confidentiality Notice: This manuscript is a privileged, confidential document. As a reviewer for TSUJCMS, you are bound under our *Peer Review Policy* and *COPE Guidelines* to maintain absolute confidentiality. You must not copy, share, cite, or use any unpublished data contained within this submission.

Part 1: Administrative Metadata

Field	Reviewer Entry
Manuscript ID Number:	
Manuscript Title:	
Date Sent to Reviewer:	
Date Review Completed:	

Part 2: Evaluation Matrix

Please score the manuscript against each parameter using the following scale:

5 = Excellent | **4** = Very Good | **3** = Adequate | **2** = Marginal | **1** = Poor |

Evaluation Criteria	Score (1–5)
Originality & Topical Relevance: Does the paper offer a fresh contribution to communication and media scholarship? Is it relevant to contemporary socio-political or public health landscapes?	
Theoretical Discourse & Framework: Is the study anchored within an appropriate theoretical model? Are the conceptual concepts defined and integrated clearly?	
Literature Grounding & Synthesis: Is contemporary literature reviewed critically? Does it correctly follow the **APA 7th Edition** referencing standard?	
Methodological Rigour: Is the research design (e.g., quantitative survey, mixed-methods, or critical qualitative) explicit, sound, and justified?	
Data Analysis & Metrics: Are data analysis tools (such as Pearson Correlation, t-tests, regression models, or thematic codes) applied accurately and interpreted correctly?	
Discussion & Implications: Does the discussion synthesize findings against existing literature? Are the recommendations practical and actionable?	
Language & Flow: Is the manuscript written in clear, academic British English, free from persistent grammatical errors or flow issues?	

Part 3: Qualitative Comments and Critiques

Please provide detailed, constructive feedback for the author(s). If you recommended revisions, please clearly list your specific requirements point-by-point.

A. Major Strengths of the Manuscript:

(What unique value or solid execution does this paper present?)

Part 4: Section-by-Section Qualitative Evaluation

Please provide explicit, constructive feedback, detailing the Major Strengths and Required Improvements for each structural component of the manuscript.

1. Title

2. Introduction, Research Problem and Objectives

3. Literature Review and Theoretical Grounding

4. Methodology and Research Design

5. Results and Data Presentation

6. Discussion of Findings

7. Conclusion, Implications and Recommendations

8. References

Part 5: Final Editorial Recommendation

*Please check exactly **ONE** of the boxes below to indicate your final decision:*

1. □**Accept without Revisions:** The manuscript is outstanding and ready for copyediting/production.
2. □**Minor Revisions Required:** The manuscript contains minor structural or typographic gaps that can be verified via an internal editorial check.
3. □**Major Revisions Required:** The manuscript has significant flaws that require a total rewrite, deeper data analysis, or a overhauled theoretical framework. Requires a second round of external peer review.
4. □**Reject:** The paper contains fundamental, irreparable conceptual or methodological flaws, or falls completely outside the scope of the journal.