

Revue Droit et Société

Rédacteurs en chef

Pierre Brunet & Laurence Dumoulin

Pôle édition de l'Association D&S

Secrétariat de rédaction : Géraldine Doité

Responsable éditoriale web : Nathalie Barnault

Evaluation of an article manuscript

Title:

Is the title explicit and effective? If not, do you have suggestions to make it more impactful?

Summary:

Is the summary clear and faithful to the content of the article? If applicable, what modification(s) would you suggest?

Keywords:

Do the keywords fit the content of the article? Have you identified any absences or omissions? Do you have any modifications to propose?

Summary evaluation:

publishable

not publishable

with minor changes

substantive in nature

stylistic in nature

with major changes; requires resubmission and a new evaluation*

* We have seen a tendency to select this option “with major changes” instead of “not publishable,” even though the recommendations provided suggest the latter option. Furthermore, please note that the selection of “with major changes” engages the evaluator(s) in assessing the new version of the manuscript.

Text of the manuscript:

Thank you for responding to the following questions and take into consideration the different rubrics in your overall assessment of the text.

1 – Does the content of the article align with the subject and editorial objectives of the journal?

2 – Is the theoretical framework of the research explicit and convincing? How is the article situated in relation to existing theories and research?

3 – Is the text well-structured, well-presented, and germane?

3.1 - For an empirical study, we will also take into consideration the appropriateness of the methodology to the stated objectives:

Is the methodology adequately presented?

Is it pertinent and appropriate?

Has the author provided information respecting deontological and scholarly rules (respect of anonymity, consent of individual interviewees, etc.)?

4 – Is the article well-written, comprehensible, and clear? Is the literary quality satisfactory?*

5 – Is the bibliography pertinent in relation to the subject treated? Is it sufficiently consistent and up to date?

6 – Is the conclusion coherent with the body of the article and the presentation?

7 – To what extent are the ideas advanced original in relation to the existing scholarship? What is the article's contribution to the furthering of research and contemporary debates?

8 – Does the manuscript borrow excessively from previously published texts?

** For this rubric, evaluators' input is particularly valuable. After having received a favorable opinion, many manuscripts contain numerous defects in terms of form and style, which require considerable work on the part of the editorial office. If the weaknesses are significant, this could justify a refusal.*

Evaluator comments (critiques that you deem useful for the editorial committee and, eventually, to be transmitted to the author of the manuscript):