

Gérontologie et société

Evaluation form for reviewers of articles submitted for publication in the “Original Articles” section

Issue title:

Article title:

Article received on:

Article sent to expert on:

Expert reviewers: Rules and involvement

Articles submitted to *Gérontologie et société* are **evaluated by way of a double-blind review by two experts** on the subject.

Articles are **submitted anonymously** to the **two reviewers** chosen by the editorial committee.

Reviewers who find that they are not sufficiently distanced to carry out an objective review must inform the editorial committee: 1) either by withdrawing themselves from the review process; or 2) by explaining the problem to the committee, which shall assess the **ethical risk**. If there is found to be a conflict of interest, other experts shall be solicited.

Reviewers must adhere to the following **confidentiality rules**:

- The reviewer should not investigate the identity of the authors and other reviewers of the article in question;
- The submitted article should not be circulated to anyone outside the editorial committee;
- The expert report must be sent to the editorial committee only.

When giving their opinion, reviewers should take care to present their views in a way that is constructive and respectful of authors' work.

Please complete this form and return it to the editorial coordination team:

by email to: cnavgerontologieetsociete@cnav.fr (please attach your form in Word format)

or by mail to: Cnav - Unité de recherche sur le vieillissement- Gérontologie et société

22 ter rue des Volontaires - 75015 Paris

Recommended for publication	No amendments required <input type="checkbox"/>
	Subject to minor amendments <input type="checkbox"/>
	Subject to major amendments <input type="checkbox"/>
Not recommended for publication	Does not meet the objectives of the journal <input type="checkbox"/>
	Quality of contribution inadequate <input type="checkbox"/>
	Quality of writing inadequate <input type="checkbox"/>

I. General comments

Please check the boxes for each of the criteria. If certain criteria do not apply, you can leave the boxes blank.

In section II, you will be able to provide further details about the different aspects of the article you have evaluated

Evaluation of content	Unsatisfactory	Less than satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory
1. Relevance to the theme of the issue	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Title in line with the content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Interest of the research question	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Originality of the research problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Appropriateness of the literature for the objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Quality of the use of literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Appropriateness of the methodology for the objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Originality of the results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Relevance of the data analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation of form	Yes	No
1. Compliance with the "author guidelines" document	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Compliance with bibliographical and referencing standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Article too long, some parts need to be deleted or consolidated (specify which ones in your comments for the authors in section II)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Article very well written, only minor corrections to be made	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Article well written, some corrections to be made	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Writing of varying quality, some parts require rewriting (specify which ones in your comments for the authors in section II)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Poor quality writing, article requires rewriting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

II. Comments for authors

These comments should detail what makes the article particularly relevant for the journal and why it would be in the journal's interest to publish it, as well as highlighting errors, omissions, or problems that justify the comments that will be sent to the author so that they can make improvements to their text.

These comments should be anonymous, and as such should not include your name anywhere.

*These comments will be sent on to authors as they are received, with no amendments made to them. The community of authors in the academic fields that encompass gerontology and its social implications is relatively small and it would be a shame to miss out on any future collaboration with this or that author. Even when explaining that the article has been rejected, please use language that will enable the author to see how they can make the required improvements, and therefore possibly re-submit their work to *Gérontologie et société*.*

III. Additional comments to the editorial committee

Please provide the editorial committee with your comments and suggestions, be they about the form or content of the article.

There is no need to repeat here the comments intended for the author, since you have already detailed these in section II of this form.

Signature of expert:
(or first and last name)

Date: