

## Reviewer Consent Form

If you accept the responsibilities of the reviewer, you must treat the materials you receive as confidential documents. This means you cannot share them with anyone without prior authorisation from the editor. Since peer review is confidential, you also must not share information about the review with anyone without permission from the editors and authors.

First read the article and then take a break from it, giving you time to think. Consider the article from the author's perspective. When you sit down to write the review, make sure you know what the journal is looking for, and have a copy of any specific reviewing criteria you need to consider. Moreover, if you want to suggest another review of the same manuscript either entirely or partially, do not hesitate to mention it.

### *Review report*

For detailed guidance on writing a review, read the Reviewer's form online. There are separate forms for quantitative research and qualitative research.

They are available online. Please visit for details [The Saharan](#)

Your review will help the editor to decide whether or not to publish the article. Giving your overall opinion and general observations of the article are essential. Your comments should be courteous and constructive, and should not include any discouraging remarks.

Providing insight into any deficiencies is important. You should explain and support your judgment so that both editors and authors are able to fully understand the reasoning behind your comments. You should indicate whether your comments are your own opinion or are reflected by the data.

- Summarise reviewed article in the form of short paragraph in space given at the end of reviewer's form. This shows the editor you have read and understood the research.
- Give your main impressions of the article, including whether it is novel and interesting, whether it has a sufficient impact and adds to the knowledge base.
- Point out any journal-specific points – does it adhere to the journal's standards?
- If you suspect plagiarism, fraud or have other ethical concerns, raise your suspicions with the editor, providing as much detail as possible. Visit [The Saharan Guidelines](#) for more information.
- Give specific comments and suggestions, including about layout and format, Title, Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Statistical errors, Results, Conclusion/Discussion, language and References.

*Reviewer’s recommendation*

When you make a recommendation in the “Reviewer Assessment Form,” it is worth considering the categories the editor most likely uses for classifying the article:

- **Accept** without revision
- **Reject** (explain the reason)
- **Revise** – either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether you would be happy to review the revised article)

The editor ultimately decides whether to accept or reject the article. The editor will weigh all views and may call for a third opinion or ask the author for a revised paper before deciding.

*Reviewer’s consent*

If you are giving consent to become the reviewer, please check ✓ the following boxes:

➤ I do not have a potential conflict of interest in any research.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
➤ If yes, then I accept the responsibility to disclose this to the editor when I respond to a specific manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
➤ I will educate myself on the blind peer review process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
➤ My review will be ready within <b>2 weeks</b> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
➤ I may provide suggestions for alternative reviewers. ( <i>optional</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
➤ I am willingly giving my consent to become the Reviewer of <i>The Saharan Journal</i> for the National Institute for African Studies (NIAS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

**Name:**

**Date:**

Please submit this form and your resume within one week for further processing at the following email: [publications@africanstudies.org.uk](mailto:publications@africanstudies.org.uk)

Thank you for your valuable time