

	TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MOMBASA		
	Document: Form	Ref No.: TUM/Form/HRM/032	
	Title: PEER REVIEW OF PUBLICATIONS		
	Department: HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT		
	Issue No. 2	Revision No. 0	Date: 5th April 2018

PART A: REVIEWEE DETAILS

Name of Candidate				
Position Applied for				
Faculty				
Department				
Publications	Title	Year of Publication	Publisher	ISBN/ISSN
	1.			
	2.			
	3.			
	4.			
	5.			
	6.			
	7.			
	8.			
	9.			
	10.			



PART B: CRITERIA

Please review the following items in the publications

S/No.	Criteria	General Comments
1.	Authorship (Review the author's contribution)	
2.	Audience (Is the intended audience relevant to the author's specialization?)	
3.	Impact Factor (Comment on the article's reception)	
4.	Introduction a) Does the author clearly define research problem(s)? b) Is his work(s) significance explained? c) Are core issues or research variables identified in all his work? d) Is specialized terminology usefully defined in all his work? e) Does the author provide adequate literature review in his work? f) Does the work discuss current research on the problem(s), and help to situate the author's own research? g) Are the research objectives clearly stated? h) Are hypotheses or specific research questions identified?	



5.	<p>Methodology</p> <p>a) Does the author clearly identify the research methodologies and any associated limitations of the research design?</p> <p>b) Are participants described, including the methods of sample selection if appropriate?</p> <p>c) Are instruments adequately described, including issues of appropriateness, validity and reliability?</p> <p>d) Do any evident biases or ethical considerations arise in relation to the methodologies?</p> <p>e) Are the methods for measuring results clearly explained and appropriate?</p>	
6.	<p>Results</p> <p>a) Are the author's major findings clearly presented?</p> <p>b) Do they adequately address the stated research objectives?</p> <p>c) Are supporting data presented?</p> <p>d) Are tables, graphs or figures helpful and well integrated with the text?</p>	
7.	<p>Discussion</p> <p>a) Do the research results validate the author's conclusions and/or recommendations?</p> <p>b) Are alternative conclusions and/or limitations of the research considered?</p> <p>c) Is there discussion of any variance between the author's research and prior research findings?</p> <p>d) Does the author's research suggest any direction for further research?</p> <p>e) Is the practical or theoretical significance of the research emphasized?</p> <p>f) Does the author recommend the revision of theory or practice in the field?</p>	



8.	<p>Relevance</p> <p>a) Is the research timely and worthwhile?</p> <p>b) Is the research design appropriately inclusive and/or sensitive to the cultural context?</p> <p>c) Are you aware of any significant omissions or errors that might affect the validity or reliability of the research?</p> <p>d) Are the results original and significant?</p> <p>e) Does the author provide fresh insight or stimulate needed discussion in the field?</p>	
9.	<p>Structure</p> <p>a) Are the articles well structured?</p> <p>b) Are the sections of appropriate length?</p> <p>c) Does the author's style and language maintain interest and clarity?</p> <p>d) Are the presentations unbiased, objective and reasonable?</p> <p>e) Is the author respectful of participants and the work of other researchers?</p>	

Recommendation to Interview Committee

PART C: DETAILS OF THE REVIEWER

Academic Rank (Eg. Professor, Associate Professor etc)	Name	Signature	Date

