

REVIEWER INFORMATION AND EVALUATION GUIDE

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your valuable contributions to the scientific studies submitted for evaluation to the Türk Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Dergisi. Our journal meticulously applies TR Dizin principles and international publication ethics principles (COPE - Committee on Publication Ethics). The peer review process is the guarantee of the scientific quality and originality of our journal.

This guide has been prepared to guide you in filling out the criteria in our journal's Reviewer Evaluation Form in an objective, fair, and compliant manner with TR Dizin standards.

1. GENERAL EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES

- **Double-Blind Peer Review and Confidentiality:** A double-blind peer review system is implemented in our journal. The manuscripts you review are confidential documents. Data, ideas, and documents contained in the study cannot be used, cited, or shared with others by the reviewer in any way before publication.
- **Impartiality and Objectivity:** Article evaluations should be conducted based on objective criteria, entirely within the framework of scientific merit, regardless of race, gender, religious belief, political view, or institutional affiliation. Reviewer critiques should be presented in a constructive, academic, and polite style; personal statements should be avoided.
- **Conflict of Interest:** If any conflict of interest or partnership (close kinship, working in the same institution, participating in a joint project, etc.) is identified with the author/authors of the article requested to be evaluated, the situation must be reported to the Area Editor without delay, and the review invitation must be rejected.
- **Detection of Ethical Violation (TR Dizin Requirement):** If plagiarism, data fabrication/falsification, duplicate publication, salami slicing, or lack of documents in studies requiring ethics committee permission is noticed in the text, the Editorial Board must be informed immediately.

2. FILLING OUT THE EVALUATION CRITERIA (1-5 SCORE SCALE) FAIRLY

The 11 items in our Reviewer Evaluation Form are scored between 1 and 5 (1=No, 3=Partially, 5=Yes). Objectivity and consistency are essential when scoring. The contents of the items in the form and the points to be considered are as follows:

#	Evaluation Criterion	Reviewer Examination Guide and Fairness Principle
1	Is it an original study related to its field?	It should be evaluated whether the study presents a new finding, a new cataloging, a new epigraphic/architectural interpretation, or a theoretical/methodological contribution to archaeology, ethnography, or related sub-disciplines. Low scores should be given to studies that merely repeat classic information.
2	Does it comply with scientific criteria?	The methodology, data collection, and analysis techniques of the research should be examined in terms of compliance with scientific standards and academic research methods.
3	Is the title compatible with the content?	It should be checked whether the title fully and clearly reflects the scope, limits, material, or period examined in the study.
4	Is the abstract compatible with the content?	It should be checked whether the abstract presents the purpose, method, main findings, and conclusion of the research in a concise manner and whether it directly matches the text content.
5	Is the selection of keywords appropriate and sufficient?	It should be examined whether the selected words are capable of representing the subject, geography, period, or method of the study and are suitable for indexing.
6	Does it comply with grammar and spelling rules?	It should be checked whether the text has spelling, punctuation, and terminological accuracy. Correct use of terms is of vital importance in archaeological/ethnographic research.
7	Is it coherent, consistent, and sufficient in terms of structure and expression?	The logical flow between the introduction, method, findings, discussion, and conclusion sections, the hierarchy of section headings, and the in-text structure should be evaluated.
8	Is the language fluent, simple, and understandable?	It should be considered whether the expression is free from unnecessarily verbose statements, clear, understandable, and appropriate for an academic style.
9	Have findings/results suitable for the research purpose been reached?	It should be questioned whether the problematics or questions stated in the introduction section are correctly answered within the framework of the obtained data.
10	Do the proposed interpretations and reached results contribute to the field?	It should be scored whether the author's own interpretations reach a scientific conclusion by comparing them with the literature and the innovation or insight it brings to the field's literature.
11	Are the references used sufficient and up-to-date in terms of quality and quantity?	It should be audited whether essential references related to the subject, up-to-date national and international publications (especially APA and field-indexed sources) are used at a sufficient level.

3. OBLIGATION TO DETAIL REJECTION, ACCEPTANCE, AND REVISION GROUNDS (TR DIZIN CRITERION)

In accordance with TR Dizin and our journal publication policy, superficial and unjustified decisions in reviewer evaluations are not accepted. It is mandatory that the FINAL decisions on the form be detailed according to the following explanations:

ATTENTION (Grounds Detailing Rule):

When one of the options "Can be published after some revisions (B)" or "Cannot be published (C)" is checked in the "CONCLUSION" section of the form, it is mandatory to write a concrete, explanatory, and justified evaluation text consisting of at least a few paragraphs in the explanation area located in the lower section.

A. "Can be Published as Is" Decision:

It should be preferred if the scientific methodology, language, bibliography, and contribution to the field of the study are at an excellent level. High scores on the reviewer form (predominantly 4 and 5) are expected.

B. "Can be Published After Some Revisions" Decision:

Checked in cases where the study has publication potential but requires textual, methodological, or bibliography-based revisions. Our reviewer must additionally select one of the following two options:

- **I Want to See the Revisions:** The sufficiency of the major/minor revisions to be made by the author is re-checked by the reviewer.
- **I Do Not Want to See the Revisions:** The requested revisions are of a minor nature, and the discretion is left to the Editorial Board and the Area Editor.

Mandatory Principle: The reviewer must explain the points requested to be revised item by item, specifying the page, paragraph, and line numbers.

C. "Cannot be Published" (Rejection) Decision:

Given for studies that lack scientific depth, have no original value, are methodologically flawed, or contain ethical violations. Simply checking the "Cannot be published" box and leaving the explanation area blank is considered a violation for our journal in TR Dizin audits. The reviewer must concretely state why the study cannot be published with scientific grounds (for example: "Literature review is incomplete", "Method is scientifically flawed", "Findings do not support the hypothesis", etc.).

4. NOTES TO BE SENT TO THE AUTHOR AND IN-TEXT MARKINGS

Our reviewers can convey their evaluation comments in two ways:

- **Via the Evaluation Form:** Suggestions, deficiencies, and constructive criticisms aimed at the author should be added to the explanation section at the bottom of the form.
- **By Marking on the Text:** If our reviewers wish, they can specify their revisions using the "Add Comment" or "Track Changes" feature on the article Word text sent to them and upload this file to the system.

Note: In comments added to the text, it must be ensured that personal information that would reveal the reviewer's identity (Word username, etc.) is hidden.

5. SIGNING AND SUBMISSION OF THE FORM

After the evaluation is completed, the Title and Name, Signature (electronic/digital or wet signature), and Date fields located at the bottom of the Form must be filled in completely and submitted to the Editorial Office via DergiPark / Journal Management System.

Editorial Board of the Türk Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Dergisi
Thank You for Your Valuable Contributions to Scientific Quality and Publication Ethics.