



Journal of Youth Impact (JYI)

Sample Reviewer Evaluation Form – Double-Blind Peer Review

Manuscript ID: JYI-2026-001

Manuscript Title: Sample

Reviewer ID (anonymous): R-17

Date: February 1, 2026

Section I: Core Evaluation (1–5 Scale)

1 = Inadequate | 2 = Weak | 3 = Adequate | 4 = Strong | 5 = Excellent

1. Appropriateness & Relevance to JYI Scope: Score = 5

2. Conceptual Soundness & Originality: Score = 4

3. Engagement with Relevant Literature: Score = 4

4. Methodological / Technical Adequacy: Score = 4

5. Clarity of Presentation & Significance: Score = 4

Section II: Strengths of the Manuscript

This is a very interesting and generally well-written contribution to an understudied topic. The manuscript demonstrates strong engagement with the literature and presents a creative experimental design. The research question is compelling, and the writing is clear overall.

Section III: Major Concerns

- The discussion section requires substantial revision to more accurately reflect the reported results. The manuscript currently implies a unique effect of tears on contingency discrimination, yet participants failed to discriminate contingency levels even in the no-tears condition. Claims suggesting a statistical interaction should be clarified or revised.
- The transition in the Hypotheses section to contingency awareness needs clearer theoretical motivation. The link between helplessness and contingency awareness should be explicitly articulated.
- The imbalance in stimuli (3 female faces and 1 male face) should be justified. Potential gender interactions should be discussed or acknowledged as a limitation.



Section IV: Minor Suggestions

- Provide additional context for cross-cultural crying statistics in the Background section.
- Clarify the phrase 'communicate a need for help' in the Motivation section.
- Clarify whether H1 is directional.
- Revise the sentence: 'This suggests the participants' limited sensitivity on contingency judgements.'
- Expand briefly on study limitations and possible future directions.

Section V: Recommendation

- Accept
- Minor Revision
- Major Revision
- Reject

Confidential Comments to the Editor (Optional):

The manuscript shows strong potential and intellectual merit. With clearer alignment between results and interpretation, it would make a valuable contribution.